

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIV

APRIL, 1931

NUMBER 2

"THE FIVE BOOKS OF MATTHEW": BACON ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

MORTON S. ENSLIN

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SOME years ago there was discovered in the monastery of Iveron on Mount Athos a curious paper manuscript of the sixteenth century, "filled with all kinds of theological extracts." It was catalogued by Lambros, as the work of "Matthew a monk" (*Ματθαίου μονάχου*). Rendel Harris, to whom New Testament students are indebted for many valuable and penetrating judgments, questioned the justice of this identification. The Matthew referred to was, he held, not an obscure mediaeval monk: he was none other than Matthew the apostle. The manuscript consists of five books, to one of which is appended six iambic verses:

Ματθαῖος εἵργει τῶν Ἰουδαίων θράσος·
"Ὡσπερ χαλινοῖς πέντε φимώσας λόγους·
"Ὅστις δὲ τούτων τὴν ἐπίρρητον πλάνην
Πλάνην ἀτέχνως (ἐξ)ελέγξει τῷ λόγῳ
"Ἀρδὴν ἀπάσας συγκαθεῖλεν αἱρέσεις·
Μήτηρ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ θεοκτόνων ἔρις.

Matthew curbs the audacity of the Jews;
Checking them in five books as it were with bridles.
Now whoever the infamous error of these
(Pure error it is) shall in argument refute
Destroys at a stroke all the heresies together;
For the mother of these is the strife of the deicide people.

This confirmed Dr. Harris in the view which he and Burkitt were maintaining, that the enigmatic 'Logia' ascribed by Papias to Matthew was a compilation of Christian Testimonies against Judaism. The fact that Papias' interpretations of these

Logia had been in five books suggested that the work interpreted had had the same arrangement. The express reference to the 'five books' in these verses seemed to make the matter reasonably sure.

In answer to Harris's thesis Bacon wrote his article, 'The "Five Books" of Matthew Against the Jews' (Expositor, 1918, Vol. 15, 87). He seconded Harris's judgment that the Matthew referred to in the verses was the apostle, but sharply contested the view that the work described as "curbing the audacity of the Jews . . . in five books as it were with bridles" was anything else than our First Gospel, which from the second century had been almost invariably regarded as written with especial reference to the Jews. The only conceivable reason why Lambros, or anyone else, should have invented an unknown Monk Matthew was that our gospel is not divided into five books, while this Athos manuscript is.

But, Bacon argued, it is quite unnecessary to seek for this supposed five-volume Book of Testimonies, for which, in spite of Harris's claims, no real evidence exists. The canonical Gospel of Matthew actually fits the description admirably. Not alone is it difficult to conceive why no hint should have been preserved had Papias been referring to anything else than our Matthew — to say nothing of the fact that in that case Papias would have to be regarded as silent regarding what from the time of Ignatius on was invariably considered the *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγιων* *par excellence* — but actually the structure of our gospel itself reveals that the description in these verses is most apt. Sir J. C. Hawkins and others had commented on the fact that the evangelist has subjoined a special formula to his "five most important bodies of sayings." But while critics had seen this clearly, they had failed to note that actually the colophon was "not so much a rounding-off of the preceding discourse, as a *link by which the narrative which follows* [was] *coupled on.*" The evangelist was concerned not alone with the five great discourses (which properly merit the title *σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγιων*) but with the narratives which led up to them and furnished them their historical settings, in precisely the manner of the successive codes of the Pentateuch.

Are we not justified then in assuming that it was the author's intention "to give his work this symmetrical, typically Jewish form of a five-fold *torah* of Jesus, a double pentad of the sayings and doings of the ministry, preceded by a Prologue describing His Davidic birth and Infancy, and closed by an Epilogue relating the Passion and Resurrection?"

As the final paragraph to this article of 1918 Bacon wrote:

The answer to this question can only be given after careful and patient study of the editorial groupings effected by the evangelist in his material. It may, however, be of interest in the discussion to which the reader's attention is now invited to know that the present writer, long before the verses from the Mount Athos MS. had come to his knowledge, had laid down as the fundamental fact in the study of the editorial treatment of evangelic material in our First Gospel, that its author intentionally constructed it upon just this plan of "five books," which to writers of the second century might well appear as the great apostolic "refutation of the Jews."

Now after twelve years Professor Bacon has sought to demonstrate by "careful and patient study of the editorial groupings effected by the evangelist" that his view is founded upon fact.¹

To attempt a review or digest of this important volume would be manifestly unwise, not only because it would mean practically to rewrite the book, but because every student of the gospels will, as a matter of course, study at first hand this volume, which will take its place with Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, as one of the most significant contributions to gospel criticism since the days of Bernhard Weiss and H. J. Holtzmann. It is wiser to consider in some detail what appear to be Bacon's most important emphases and their implications.

In his preface Bacon sounds a note that is the burden of the whole subsequent argument. The gospel called Mt² is not directly or indirectly a primary or apostolic source. All attempts to accord to it a halo of apostolic authorship by the assumption that it is a second and modified translation or edi-

¹ Benjamin W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1930. Pp. xxvi, 533.

² In this article Bacon's use of the symbols Mt, Mk, Lk to indicate the canonical gospels or their authors will be followed.

tion of an original Aramaic Mt are sheer folly, and, more than that, tend to perpetuate the second-century mistake that it is the preferred source of knowledge for the sayings and doings of Jesus. If any progress is to be made, this myth of an original Aramaic Mt from the pen of one of the twelve, which Jerome falsely claimed to have seen and translated, must be decisively and without qualification rejected. And similarly the equally vicious fallacy of the 'Matthaean Logia,' popular since the days of Schleiermacher, its protagonist, must be discountenanced completely. That there was a source of material used by Mt and Lk to supplement the deficiencies of Mk is certain from the evidence of Mt and Lk themselves, but it is not this of which Papias is making mention. To refer to Q — Bacon prefers to call it S, since Q is only a fractional part of it — as 'The Logia,' or 'The Matthaean Logia,' or 'The Logia spoken of by Papias,' is equally misleading. Papias is not referring to anything but our canonical Mt, which he believed (mistakenly, to be sure) to have been written by the Apostle Matthew. Furthermore, the use of the designation Logia for S is unfortunate not only because it gives countenance to the mistaken notion that this was what Papias was referring to, but because it prejudices the nature of the source itself by suggesting that it was a catena of sayings. This for Bacon is a most serious error. Actually, S was a real gospel, complete with even some sort of a passion narrative.

Although almost all scholars today agree that Papias is referring to our Mt, some maintain that he has misunderstood his informant, who was referring to something else, as SQ (so Streeter). This too, says Bacon, is equally confusing. As the source of his information about Mk Papias mentions "the elder," but for his statement regarding Mt he cites no authority at all. Simply that the two excerpts follow one another in Eusebius does not justify the popular but groundless assumption that *καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε* applies to both. Papias' apparent purpose was to explain why this gospel, which he knew and prized, was in Greek while its author spoke Hebrew (Aramaic). Presumably he had become convinced from outside information that Matthew was its author (what

his source of information was we do not know); his observation that it was originally written in Hebrew is most probably his own conjecture or deduction. His further observation, that "each one translated it as he was able," can hardly be due to his own deduction, but to a tradition which he had received that targuming was a common occurrence in the bilingual churches to the eastward.

Furthermore, in his exposition of this gospel, which he accepted without reservation as the authentic production of the Apostle Matthew and which accordingly (*pace* Streeter) he used as the standard by which he judged Mk and justified the 'elder's' criticism that the book was οὐ μέντοι τάξει, he himself wrote five books, and this makes it at least probable that he was adapting his comments to the nature of the work discussed. But, Professor Bacon may be asked, are we to assume that because Origen wrote commentaries on Lk in five volumes³ he therefore considered that gospel to be so divided? It is only fair, however, to Bacon to make very clear his contention that while Papias was referring to our canonical Mt, his words (τὰ λόγια) are not to be interpreted as the *title* of the book — then as now Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον — but as a description of its contents. In this volume was "*the compend* (σύνταξις) of the Lord's oracles (τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια) *par excellence*." It is impossible to praise too highly this admirable and crystal-clear exposition of Bacon's as to what Papias' testimony is and is not.

By the time, then, of Papias the tradition of apostolic authorship had arisen and gained acceptance. But what were the roots of this tradition? Why "According to Matthew?" The argument which Bacon advances in answer to this question is highly complicated and needs to be tested link by link. In this review only the results can be stated. From the view of Streeter that Antioch was the birthplace of Mt, Bacon dissents. Antioch was not its place of origin, but its focus of dissemination. It was in Antioch that it speedily surpassed Mk and Lk. The former had been brought there from Rome and was dignified by a strong Petrine tradition. Lk (or at least the type of

³ Jerome, *Interpr. Hom. Orig. in Luc. Prologus*.

gospel story represented in Lk 1, 5 — Acts 15, 33) most probably was produced in Antioch. How then could Mt, had Mt been produced in this city, have silenced the claims both of Mk and of the Antiochian-Petrine tradition, especially since it clashed with the latter on important points? No, Mt was not produced in Antioch, but arrived there with an already established reputation. Its place of origin, as distinct from its place of dissemination, was among the Jewish-Christian communities of northern and northeastern Syria which had originally taken their type of Christian teaching from Antioch itself.

But though Mt reached Antioch in possession of a dignity which made a title unnecessary, and designated simply as 'the gospel,' it soon became requisite to distinguish it from the gospels already in circulation at that great metropolis. Hence the title, 'According to Matthew.'

But why according to *Matthew*? Bacon makes an interesting suggestion.⁴ In Mk 2, 13-17 we find a curious phenomenon. The taxgatherer Levi, son of Alphaeus, appears as the fifth apostle, yet in the list of the twelve which follows (3, 13-19) he fails to appear. Lk follows Mk in this curiosity. But Mt (9, 9), in the parallel to Mk 2, 14, substitutes 'Matthew' for 'Levi,' son of Alphaeus. This has often been taken as an indication that Matthew was really the author of the First Gospel, that he was gently whispering in the reader's ear, 'I am the real Levi of whom Mk relates this; I have two names, one Levi, the other Matthew.' But this traditional explanation is rendered grossly improbable, not alone from the nature of the gospel itself but from further considerations. The Western text of Mk 2, 14 has substituted, obviously for the sake of harmony with 3, 13-19, 'James' for 'Levi.' It is not unlikely that Mt 9, 9 originally had 'James,' that is, that it was based on the Western reading of Mk. Later, however, 'James' was changed to 'Matthew' to conform to the list in Mt 10, 2-4. The reasons for this subsequent change were two:

⁴ This argument was the basis of his article, 'Why "According to Matthew,"' *Expositor*, 1920, Vol. 20, 92. Bacon's present volume constantly embodies earlier studies, usually transcribing the argument with such brevity that the reader finds study of the earlier discussion advisable.

(1) ὁ τελώνης in 10, 3 is a gloss, originally intended to apply to James son of Alphaeus, thus reflecting the Western reading of Mk 2, 14;

(2) when this gloss was copied in subsequent manuscripts it entered the text (by error) at the wrong place, after 'Matthew' instead of after the next name, 'James.' Later 'Matthew' replaced 'James' in 9, 9 for harmony. It is accordingly not impossible that it was from this curious harmonization of readings that the tradition "According to Matthew" arose. It is not unimportant to observe that if this clever argument be accepted, whether or not it explains the rise of the title of the First Gospel, it does nullify the popular assertion that Matthew was especially fitted to write a gospel because he was a τελώνης. As a matter of fact, it was Levi, not Matthew, who held that office.⁵

But while Bacon inclines to the opinion that conjecture based upon Mt 9, 9 was the probable source of the title, he suggests that an intermediate step probably took place. Not only Irenaeus and the later writers who were dependent upon him, but Epiphanius (who Bacon maintains has too long enjoyed the reputation of being the most blundering fool among the post-nicene fathers) mentions an Ebionite gospel, "which is According to Matthew." In a quotation preserved by Epiphanius Matthew is distinctly referred to in the second person: "And thee Matthew sitting at the toll-booth, I called and thou didst follow me." Accordingly, Bacon hazards that since it is improbable that the Ebionites whose gospel it was would have referred to it as other than 'the Gospel,' and most unlikely that outsiders would have so designated it had the canonical gospel already had such a title, it is quite possible that this title ('according to Matthew') was first conferred upon the later apocryphal writing, whose contents apparently made a claim in that direction, and that the title was afterward transferred to the canonical gospel. This speculation is interesting, and the discussion of the nature of this Ebionite gospel (*Ev. Hebr.*) is most instructive, but a good many questions arise.

⁵ Is it possible that the "Matthias" of Acts 1, 23 ff. is at all connected with this James-Levi-Matthew confusion?

In this second stage of the writing and dissemination of our gospel we have it spreading southward from its place of origin down the Euphrates in Aramaic targum form and westward to Antioch in Greek. Here "Ignatius accepts it, most likely along with a claim that it was (perhaps in some broad sense) 'according to' Matthew." Then the third step is its canonization, with the title, now no longer in a "broad sense," ratified. This third step Bacon feels took place in Rome,⁶ as a consequence of the visit of Ignatius. Its widespread acceptance in Asia Minor was due not only to the verdict of Rome, but to the fact that Ignatius had sponsored it in Phrygia.

It must be admitted that Bacon's view of Ignatius' relation to Mt is a bit perplexing. On pp. 30 f. he expresses himself with great caution. "The *amount* of Ignatius' quotation from Mt on the assumption that he took the preposition 'according to' in the same strict sense as Papias, is certainly surprisingly small." And not only the amount but the character of the dependence surprises him. The principal indebtedness Ignatius shows is to the story of the star. To prove to the Smyrnaeans⁷ that Jesus "was in the flesh after the resurrection" Ignatius strangely restricts himself to the parallel to Lk 24, 39 f. found in the apocryphon, *The Doctrine of Peter*. And so, Bacon concludes, "the inference seems reasonable from the amount and character of Ignatius' quotations from Mt . . . no less than from his disregard of it in favor of uncanonical report, that the Bishop of Antioch did *not* take the preposition *κατά* in its title in any such strict sense as Papias, though he would hardly do otherwise than employ the ordinary title if he had occasion to distinguish this Gospel from others."

Yet it was Ignatius who had sponsored it in Antioch, had championed it through Phrygia, and whose "prominent use of the Matthean Epiphany story of Magi and Star" was important in bringing Rome to put her seal upon this account so divergent from the adoptionist Mk. And furthermore, in his

⁶ Bacon, following Streeter, assumes on the basis of the Syriac MS., "As to the star," a council de recipiendis libris in Rome in 120 (119) A.D., in which Mt was accorded canonical rank largely by reason of the testimony of the church of Antioch.

⁷ Ign., Smyrn. 3, 2.

discussion of the question of Papias' authority for his statements about Mt, Bacon had concluded, "If an individual name be demanded, Ignatius, who twenty-five years before had passed through Phrygia and Asia, using this Gospel in his letters and almost certainly commending it orally as an antidote to the heresies he so vigorously denounces, is much more likely than John the Elder to have first given currency to the statements on which Papias relies for his confident but mistaken assertions regarding Mt" (p. 28).

Or again, since the gospel is to be dated "80-100, or more exactly 90-95," and since Ignatius makes use of it within a decade or two at the most, it is necessary to assume a very rapid growth for this somewhat complicated Matthaean tradition. First the Ebionites must produce their 'Synopticon.' For this work there must arise the title "According to Matthew," or at least it must become known by that designation to outsiders, who then transfer this reputation to Mt, since when the latter arrived in Antioch it must have had some sort of Matthaean flavor or reputation to satisfy the condition Bacon maintains in order to account for its instant acceptance there. It would appear to me on the whole easier to explain the presence of the comparatively small quantity of material which Bacon labels N (that is, material derived from a suppositious Aramaic targum anterior to Mt) as being due to the use of Aramaic sources available in Antioch, and thus feel free to consider Antioch the place of origin of the gospel and not merely the focus of its dissemination. From this centre it could have spread east into the bilingual districts and have given rise to the targums and subsequent apocryphal and heretical gospels. There is nothing in the gospel itself, with the possible exception of this N-material, which would exclude Antioch — in fact the community from which Bacon would have it originate had received its Christian knowledge from Antioch. The most natural source of Mt 16, 17-19, with its signal emphasis upon Peter, is not a Nazarene targum emanating from Edessa, but Antioch itself, where the claims of Jerusalem to be the head of Christendom because it enjoyed the leadership of James the Lord's own brother are thus decisively challenged, 'Yes,

but the Lord himself specifically designated Peter for leadership.' And the tradition that Peter was Antioch's first bishop has much to commend it. Bacon is well within the limits of the facts when he maintains that the Petrine emphasis of Mt is pronounced — in fact, were it not for Papias' statement regarding Peter and Mark, the modern reader would be more inclined to see a Petrine strain in Mt. All of this speaks for Antioch. It is interesting to observe that the three notable "Petrine supplements" (14, 28-33; 16, 17-19; 17, 24-27) are all labeled N by Bacon. Bacon may well be correct in his view that these Petrine supplements are legendary and haggadic amplification of the more sober Markan narratives, but what objection is there to the view that Antioch was the place where they took their rise? Even assuming that they are of a piece with the edifying material with which the targums abound, there seems little reason for denying that in Antioch, and for that matter in many other cities outside of Palestine, Aramaic was spoken by at least a respectable minority of Jews. It seems a bit arbitrary to limit material of this sort to districts east of Damascus, simply because in later years apocryphal gospels which may perhaps be designated loosely as somewhat resembling targums are said to have been found there.

But to this the author might well object that Lk is to be seen as originating from Antioch, and that since both Mt and Lk came into being at about the same time this would be fatal to the scholarly shibboleth of their independence.⁸ Of course the answer is easy that many scholars, as, for example, Streeter, would deny completely the Antiochian origin of Lk-Acts, simply because Acts so conspicuously ignores Peter's contact with the city — Antioch's proudest boast. Personally, if it is necessary to relinquish Antioch as the place of origin of either Mt or Lk, I should much prefer to close its gates to Lk, and that solely by reason of the comparative emphasis upon Peter. But after all, what students of the Synoptic gospels need is a modern Wrede redivivus to raise anew his protests against comfortable acceptance of "points established beyond the shadow

⁸ It is to be remembered, however, that one of the classic arguments for their coincidence in date is based on their mutual independence.

of a doubt" — this time the mutual independence of the two junior Synoptists. But this is not the place to attempt such a feat, nor should queries about the wisdom of distinguishing between place of origin and focus of dissemination obscure the fact that Bacon has turned a flood of light upon these early pages of gospel beginnings.

Of no less importance than this sane examination of the 'Logia' of Papias, with its devastating result for many commonly expressed interpretations of the passage, is Bacon's emphasis on the artificial structure of Mt. Too often Mt has been classed simply as 'the editor,' and thus considered to have merely excerpted and pieced together material from earlier writings. Such is far from the case. Mt does not keep his personality in the background at all. He is vastly more than an editor. He is in every sense of the word the author of the gospel. This is not to imply that he did not use sources. The great bulk of his writing is based upon what others had recorded, but he has not scrupled to interpret, to rearrange, to suppress, and to rewrite. The critic of the First Gospel must have but one desire if he is to understand that gospel: he must think Mt's thoughts after him.

This contention is of fundamental importance to Bacon's whole position, for only if this be so, can his view of the five-book structure be established. It is not the case that Mt found five discourses ready to hand. With the exception of the first — the Sermon on the Mount, of which some sort of nucleus already existed in S — the discourses are of his own construction. Here are examples: W. C. Allen is quite correct in his observation that 25, 31-46 "reads like a Christian homily." It reads like a homily because this is precisely what it is. It is the free composition of Mt himself, based on Mk 9, 37 as the text. Or again, the parable of the Ten Virgins (Mt 25, 1-13) is Mt's own expansion of Lk 12, 35 f. The two short parables of the Hid Treasure and the Costly Pearl (Mt 13, 44-46) are not to be sought in some source (such as Streeter's M), nor even in S. They are to be seen as Mt's own free composition to enforce a favorite doctrine. In fact it is in his use of parables

that the complete freedom which Mt exercises is most clearly seen. Here Bacon is well within the facts. The often expressed notion that the parables offer in purest form the historic words of Jesus receives little aid or comfort from the author. There may have been a greater tendency to alter narrative than discourse, partly through reverence — though this point is often decidedly overstressed, partly through necessity, but the significant point to be observed is that the parables are to be classed with narrative rather than with discourse in respect to their degree of exemption from transcriptional change. They are by their nature illustrative fiction. Not only does Mt feel perfectly free to rewrite this sort of material — a classic example is his parable of the Slighted Invitation (22, 1–10) with its supplement of the man without the wedding garment (22, 11–14), which latter may well have been a parable of Johanan ben Zacchai, whose disciple Mt probably was (so von Dobschütz) — but also to compose it afresh. In short, “the Matthean parables and smaller supplements not derived from Mk or S may often be ascribed to Mt’s own rabbinic or catechetical resources, which of course include ‘things new and old’ from both Synagogue and Church” (p. 96). The significance of this essentially sound judgment might well have been expanded. The parables which occur in more than one of our gospels are few, and regularly show the result of free editing and paraphrase. Ought not this to warn us that those parables which we have in only one form have in all probability undergone precisely the same modification? Accordingly, far from being the best source of the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, they are as a matter of fact the poorest. In addition to the natural alteration that could not be avoided during the fluid days of oral transmission, they were by their very nature most valuable to Christian teachers for buttresses to their own views. So one will hardly err if he adopts it as a working hypothesis that the occasion and setting in which a parable occurs is probably purely artificial, while the adoption of this setting has almost certainly occasioned further alterations in the form and phraseology of the parables themselves. They may occasionally, indeed, reflect the kind of teaching Jesus uttered, but they can

not be used by us with any degree of confidence as a source for knowledge of the truths he wished to stress. Usually they are unintelligible without some clue to their original context, and this is precisely what we do not have.

This important emphasis of Bacon's that Mt exercised the widest freedom in his use of sources, especially parables, may profitably be expanded a bit further. The same probability is to be felt in the early Christian use of the sayings of Jesus other than parables. Here two types of evidence may be considered. The Fourth Gospel is a classic example of the freedom felt in the early days of the second century toward the words of Jesus. In this gospel there is no hesitation about composing freely long discourses after the manner approved by historians from the earliest days. Nor is there the least reason to assume that in this tendency the Fourth Gospel was unique. J. H. Bernard, in his recent commentary on John, appears to me justified in his protest against the popular over-contrast between John and the Synoptists. There are differences, and yet these differences should not cause us to overlook the agreements. Bernard's purpose is of course apologetic: the Fourth Gospel is less different; that is, it is more historical than we had assumed. Does not an impartial study of Bernard's evidence lead to the opposite conclusion, that the Synoptists are more like John than we had admitted?

Confidence in this conclusion is heightened by the evidence of the so-called apocryphal gospels, of the *agrapha*, and of the variant readings which some gospel manuscripts (such as D) contain. The question of their degree of fidelity to the utterances of Jesus contained in the canonical gospels is of relatively small importance. The significant thing is that they evince a vastly greater freedom in revamping and rephrasing the traditional utterances in early times than we have sometimes recognized. The very fact that sayings and frequent aphorisms, not to mention parables (illustrative fiction), were so valuable in later situations in the church, should warn us of the likelihood that they have suffered a complete metamorphosis in the process.

Because of this conspicuous tendency of Mt to recast and

rewrite his sources and to supply from his own "mental 'treasure'" what he felt to be lacking, Bacon is unwilling to accept either a proto-matthew or Streeter's special Matthaean source M. It is wiser, he feels, to assume that Mt deliberately omitted portions of S which Lk chose to use than to assume that here Mt was following a different source in which this material was not contained, and wiser to assume further that the special single-tradition (P) is made up of different types of material: some derived from oral tradition (O); some from S (in sections which Lk did not chose to utilize), which Bacon names SP; some from a sort of precanonical form of Aramaic gospel circulating in the region from which Mt sprang and which "contaminated" it; while the remainder of P is to be regarded as the free composition and contribution of Mt himself (R).

With this position, which is essential to Bacon's view of the way this converted rabbi set about forming his second torah, I find myself on the whole in hearty agreement. But because it appears to me essentially sound I find considerable difficulty in Bacon's confidence that for Lk the problem is different. Although it is unnecessary to assume a connected source M employed by Mt, it is imperative, he maintains, to assume for Lk a special source L (somewhat parallel to S), although he is by no means ready to agree with Streeter that L is a first edition of Lk, as yet uncontaminated by Mk.

Bacon's chief reason for finding L necessary is apparently the attitude of Lk toward Mk's passion narrative. Up to this point in his gospel Lk has followed Mk almost slavishly, rarely venturing to alter the latter's order. To be sure, he entirely omits Mk 6, 45-8, 26, and interjects two large sections of non-markan material in 6, 20-8, 3 and 9, 51-18, 14. The real crux of the problem, however, is that "Lk almost entirely supersedes Mk's Passion story by another of unknown origin, in many respects historically superior" (p. 105). Bacon may remark (p. 106) that a discussion of Lk's sources and editorial methods lies outside the scope of this volume and must be left for others, yet his acceptance of this hypothetical L is utilized constantly. From both of his conclusions regarding Lk's passion story I strongly dissent. I doubt seriously whether Lk is forsaking

Mk for another source, and I am equally skeptical as to his resultant narrative being historically superior. Bacon argues, and rightly, that Lk's purpose (unlike Mt's) is to present a διήγησις λεχθέντων ἢ πραχθέντων, and that this implies his desire to make a more readable narrative. But this sound observation appears to me to entail consequences which exclude the necessity for any considerable source other than Mk and S (especially if this latter contained a considerable narrative tissue "leading up to" discourse material, as Bacon assumes that it did) in order to provide Lk with his narrative skeleton. Lk's purpose, as set forth in his admirable preface (Lk 1, 1-4), is to narrate the birth and growth of Christianity from its inception in Palestine to its establishment in very different form in Rome. He has a very clearly defined philosophy of history, and is at pains to portray the unfolding panorama of Christianity's development. One step leads logically and continuously (note the word καθεξῆς) to the next. There are no loose ends nor unconnected sequences. The material he employs is carefully chosen and thoroughly articulated. The first centre was Galilee, the next Jerusalem, whence in broadening circles (always advancing, never retreating) the gospel spread to "the uttermost part of the earth." In earlier articles⁹ I have tried to show that this dominating interest led him to produce narrative material from the scantiest sources. Is it necessary to assume that he had before him a source which told of the trip from Nazareth to Bethlehem made necessary by the census? Is it not more probable that the account is his own creation in order to harmonize the two variant traditions, both of which he accepted, that Jesus' family had from the earliest years lived in Nazareth and yet that their child had been born in Bethlehem? Nor does it appear to me improbable that the account in Acts of the connection of Paul with the stoning of Stephen has no historical foundation. It was in Jerusalem that the Christian mission to gentile lands arose, and it was Stephen's death that caused this beginning. Paul was the one who above all others was instrumental in the movement. Therefore Paul

⁹ 'Paul and Gamaliel,' *Journal of Religion*, July, 1927, VII; 'The Ascension Story,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1928, XLVII, Parts 1 and 2.

is transferred from Damascus to Jerusalem and enters the story at this crucial moment. Or again, need we assume that Lk's story of the ascension of Jesus, which certainly appears to clash with the closing narrative in his gospel, was based on some similar story he had discovered in the course of his "accurate tracing of the course of all things from the first?" Is it not more probable that he ran across some tradition, perhaps somewhat akin to that of Paul's in 1 Corinthians, that Jesus had appeared for many days, and from this produced the ascension story? Bacon is of course loath to admit any real use by Mt of Lk, but does not reject von Dobschütz's contention that perhaps "some remote inkling" of Lk's method of repairing the defects of Mk, led him to prefix a genealogy and birth story, and to add the story of Jesus' resurrection appearance to the women (28, 9 f.). But is it any more fantastic to speculate as to whether Lk might not have received a similar "remote inkling" of Mt's story of a resurrection appearance *in Jerusalem*, which, together with his desire to show "continuously" the successive great stages of the Christian movement, led him drastically to rewrite Mk's account, omitting the whole story of the flight to Galilee and the appearances there (at least implied in Mk), and stressing the fact that as soon as the Galilean pilgrims in company with their Master reached Jerusalem, that city became the next theatre of the Holy War?

Lk demonstrably rewrites and revamps his sources, occasionally, at least, (*pace* Hawkins and Bacon) inventing the surroundings of the discourse that he repeats.¹⁰ After all, the whole matter of L depends on the question as to the extent to which Lukan differences can be explained as the work of Lk himself? It appears to me that the sole value of L is that it gives relief to puzzled interpreters of the Third Gospel who cannot bring themselves to allow Lk to make (or make up) history, but find it necessary to postulate another source for him to draw upon.

I have no thought of implying that Bacon's studies of Lk have not been intense and profound, but I cannot help wondering whether if he had made as searching a study of Lk as he has of Mt, he might not have come out of it as skeptical of the

¹⁰ Cf. Lk 19, 11; 15, 1 ff. — to cite but two conspicuous examples.

need of postulating an L as he now is of the existence of an M. This hypothesis of Feine has gained a new lease of life through the valuable work of Streeter, Taylor, and Easton — to mention but three — but while their researches have put us greatly in their debt it is not impossible that as the years go by Lk may be obliged to accept responsibility for forsaking Mk when he thought he could pen a better story himself.

Bacon's view that Mt felt perfectly free to exercise the widest freedom with his sources leads him to argue for an even more complete use of Mk than has usually been asserted. In contrast to Lk, who appropriates about half of Mk, Mt uses almost all of it, not transcribing it in blocks as does Lk but skillfully interweaving it. Narrative is rarely preserved by Mt for its own sake; rather, Bacon holds, his purpose is to condense his narrative into five sections and an epilogue as a setting for his new legislation. One might almost say that Mt rewrites Mk with the greatest freedom in order to make it an orderly compend of the Lord's commandments. So he can close his gospel with the appropriate injunction to the Twelve that they teach all men everywhere to obey all things whatsoever they have been commanded. In an earlier discourse their function is conceived to be that of "scribes made disciples of the kingdom of heaven" (13, 52). As a matter of fact this eighth parable (13, 51 f.), which Mt appends to the seven in which Jesus reveals the mystery of the kingdom, provides an admirable miniature of Mt himself — a rabbi who has become a church catechist. With his use of the Septuagint he is the prototype of an Edersheim with a King James Version instead of the Hebrew text! Not alone his "effort to perpetuate the scribal system in the Church by bestowing on Peter an office corresponding to the presidency of a college of scribes" (16, 18 f.) but the everywhere evident neo-legalistic motive, his bitterness toward "scribes and Pharisees" and the unbelievers among his own people, his emphasis on proof from Scripture, his insistence on "good works," his special interest in moral regulations and discipline in the Church — all these reveal the converted rabbi (pp. 132 f.). We do not know his name, but we have his portrait.

Perhaps the surest evidence of all comes from his clearly revealed unbounded reverence for the Law. He cannot conceive of an arrangement for these "commandments to be observed" which would better the Mosaic provision. As the torah consisted of books of the commandments of Moses with each body of law introduced by a lengthy narrative devoted to the "'signs and wonders' by which Jehovah 'with an outstretched hand and a mighty arm' redeemed his people from Egyptian bondage," so the Christian legalist presents the new legislation of the second Moses in the same form. "Each of the 'five books' of his 'syntaxis of the logia' of Jesus begins with an introductory narrative and closes with a stereotyped formula linking its discourse to the next succeeding narrative section" (p. 81). There is no better way to reveal Bacon's view of this (to him) all-important structural arrangement of the First Gospel than to quote his own summary:

No attempt to define the nature and purpose of Mt's revision of Mk is adequate which does not bring into true perspective this constructive feature of the work. It is not enough to take up *seriatim* the particular changes effected by the evangelist in the order and language of his model, though this has been done many times, notably by Allen in his volume of the *ICC*. To understand *why* these changes are made, more especially the changes of order in Books II and III,¹¹ one must gain some insight into the evangelist's design as revealed in the outline and structure of his compilation. For these five Books are certainly not, as imagined by Godet and some of the older critics,

¹¹ Bacon's analysis of the Gospel of Matthew is as follows:

Preamble: chapters 1-2

Book I. Concerning Discipleship 3, 1-7, 29

Div. A. Introductory Narrative 3, 1-4, 25

Div. B. First Discourse 5, 1-7, 29

Book II. Concerning Apostleship 8, 1-11, 1

Div. A. Introductory Narrative 8, 1-9, 35

Div. B. The Discourse 9, 36-11, 1

Book III. Concerning the Hiding of the Revelation 11, 2-13, 53

Div. A. Israel is Stumbled 11, 2-12, 50

Div. B. Teaching in Parables 13, 1-53

Book IV. Concerning Church Administration 13, 54-19, 1a

Div. A. Jesus and the Brotherhood 13, 54-17, 20 [21]

Div. B. The Discourse. Church Administration 17, 22-19, 1a

Book V. Concerning the Judgment 19, 1b-26, 2

Div. A. Jesus in Judea 19, 1b-22, 46

Div. B. Discourse on Judgment to Come 23, 1-26, 2

Epilogue: 26, 3-28, 20

derived from an earlier composition such as the imaginary "Logia spoken of by Papias," but with the single exception of the first (wholly composed of S material) are uniformly *built up on the basis of Mk*. They therefore belong strictly to Mt himself so far as structural arrangement is concerned, and indeed can be proved by evidence of phraseology and purpose to be, even as respects material, the work of his own pen to a much larger extent than is commonly realized. . . . The purpose of our evangelist in revising and expanding the Gospel of Mk is to furnish an ordered Compend of the Commandments of Jesus. His method is to introduce large extracts of S material, also revised and expanded, in the form of five discourses of Jesus, the first on Filial Righteousness (chh. 5-7), the second on The Duty of Evangelists (ch. 10), the third on The Mystery of the Kingdom (ch. 13), the fourth on The Duty of Church Administrators (ch. 18), the fifth on Preparedness for the Coming (chh. 23-25). Naturally the narrative introductions are in most cases principally based on Mk, though in III, A most of the material is from the Second Source, and in I, A and V, A, Q furnishes considerable sections of the introductory narrative. In chh. 1 f. a general Introduction or Preamble, derived neither from S nor Mk, is prefixed to the whole composition. Its material naturally calls for special study as throwing most light on the particular standpoint and environment of the evangelist (p. 82).

As suggested above, Bacon reduces to a minimum the amount of Mk which Mt omitted. The exorcism (Mk 1, 23-28), which duplicates Mk 5, 1-20 (= Mt 8, 28-34), is neglected through his compression of Mk 1, 16-39. The view of Mk 1, 34b is objectionable to Mt, but is compensated for by doubling the exorcism of Mk 5, 1-20 (= Mt 8, 28-34). The parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mk 4, 26-29) — Bacon prefers to call it the Patient Husbandman — is not omitted by Mt as is commonly assumed. Actually Mt transforms this parable into the parable of the Tares in the Wheat (13, 24-30), which he places in the same relative position. Mk 7, 32-37 and 8, 22-26 are not neglected by Mt. Though he omits them, he compensates for this by making Jesus heal *two* blind men (9, 27-34) and by adding that the dumb man (12, 22) was also blind. The only Markan narrative which is really omitted by Mt is the story of the Widow's Mite (Mk. 12, 41-44). Bacon is so convinced that Mt squeezes Mk dry that he inclines to the guess that this incident was not an original part of Mk's text, but that it made its way into Mk from the *Ev. Hebr.*, where it stood with the story of the woman taken in sin.

Because of this extreme reluctance to admit any neglect of Mk it is a bit surprising that Mt 6, 14-15 is not attributed to

Mk. On the contrary Bacon is insistent that I, B is "wholly composed of S material" and without a trace of the use of Mk. To me it seems decidedly more probable that these verses are due to Mk 11, 25. One of Mt's peculiarities is his perfect readiness completely to rewrite his sources and to juggle the order freely; but at the same time, when he does take over a section without feeling it necessary to recast it, he tends rigidly to preserve the vocabulary of his source. This tendency again and again aids us in seeing the way he interweaves his sources. Now in the Lord's Prayer the word *ὀφειλήματα* is used (6, 12), while in vs. 14 *παραπτώματα* makes its appearance. This latter occurs in Mk 11, 25. Bacon prefers to explain 6, 14-15 as the product of R himself, probably influenced by Ecclus. 28, 1 f. But this fails entirely to account for the use of *παραπτώματα*, not to mention the other verbal similarities between Mt 6, 14-15 and Mk 11, 25.

For myself I find no difficulty in assuming that although I, B is principally produced from S-material, nevertheless Mt has in this instance used — probably without the necessity of opening his volume of Mk¹² — the similar saying. Then, in line with his custom, he rounds off the quotation by adding the corresponding "but if you do not forgive. . . ." It is not unimportant to observe that in the Western text of Mk this Matthaean expansion is found (vs. 26). Although obviously this Western addition is only one of many attempts to harmonize the text of Mk with that of Mt, it is an indication that at a very early time the passages were rightly considered parallels.

One further phase of Bacon's view of Mt's use of Mk is of interest. As has already been indicated, the narrative introductions leading up to the discourses in the five great themes are largely composed of Markan material. In Book III, however, the situation is reversed. In this case the discourse is taken as a whole from Mk 3, 20-4, 34, while the "narrative" that leads up to the discourse, "consists predominantly of discourse, being drawn almost wholly from S" (p. 377). Yet, Bacon assures us, this apparent inconsistency is not to be taken as evidence that the proposed analysis of the gospel is faulty.

¹² Bacon emphasizes the fact that Mt knew his sources, especially Mk, memoriter.

It is due simply to the fact that Mt's primary source, Mk, has departed in this instance "from its usual practise of limitation to narrative in order to illustrate in a chapter of parables (Mk. 4, 1-34) its theory of the use of parable to hide the mystery of the kingdom from 'outsiders'" (p. 213). This departure of Mk compelled Mt to reverse *his* usual practice and to fall back on a different source, S, for his narrative introduction, which accordingly may only with reservations be classed as narrative.

It would be quite beyond the scope of this paper to attempt a review, or a thorough critique (and any other sort would be futile), of the analyses of these "five books." This can be profitably conducted only with Bacon's own full argument before one. Personally I am inclined to agree with his main contention that the striking arrangement of five discourses, each concluded by essentially the same tradition formula, in a writing which is so obviously Jewish in tone and so insistent that Jesus' teaching must be regarded as a new Law which separates its observers from the Synagogue,¹³ is most naturally understood as not accidental but intentional. There is no greater peril to sobriety than the temptation to succumb to the intoxication of 'sacred arithmetic,' with the resultant discoveries of groups of sevens, tens, and the like, and the readiness to lay the ancient writings on the procrustean bed. Occasionally, however, an arrangement is so methodical and obvious that it appears an equal peril to treat it as coincidence.

Another challenge that our author sounds concerns the nature of the so-called Second Source. As has already been indicated, Bacon prefers to call it S, instead of Q. Q is not a source, but a convenient designation for a class of material, namely, that portion of the larger source utilized by both Mt and Lk. That is, Q is the sum total of Mt-Lk agreements for which there are no parallels in Mk. Not only is it misleading to speak of Q as a source — for that gives an entirely erroneous impression of

¹³ This contrast (p. 168) with Lk, which is "a new *gospel* which separates believers from the world," is most happy and recalls Kirsopp Lake's pun: "Mt is a new Law; Lk a new *λαός*."

the size and nature of this source — but also a contradiction in terms is involved when the question is raised, 'Did Mk use Q,' for by the definition of Q of course the presence of Markan material is excluded.¹⁴

It must be recognized not only that S is larger than its one certainly isolated element Q, but also that our knowledge of its content and general structure is restricted to what can be deduced from Q. Once freed from the lingering suspicion that Papias was referring to this source in his choice of the word *λόγια*, we have no reason to assume that S consisted of short sayings loosely connected. To be sure, Mt and Lk regularly preferred Mk as their source for narrative; but this is not sufficient ground for denying that S contained narrative. Far from being a series of disconnected sayings (*Spruchsammlung*), as Wernle argued, it is much more probable that S can be called with justice a 'gospel.' It was undoubtedly different in structure from Mk. Very likely the discourse-element predominated, but if any term for it other than 'gospel' is to be employed, *Redesammlung* is surely happier than *Spruchsammlung*. Bacon does not attempt to reconstruct S, but it is apparent that its content is clearly defined for him. Not only was there a thread of narrative which ran through it, or at least which "led up to" the various sayings of the Galilean ministry, but this thread of narrative-material also "led up to" some sort of a passion story. After a highly involved and hardly convincing argument he can conclude:

We are therefore under no compulsion to accept the theory that S was "not a gospel." We know that it began as a drama of the Message of Salvation, the divine Messenger being introduced to the spectator as "the Son of God" in a voice from heaven, while a forecast of his redemptive career was conveyed in the symbolic story of the Temptation. It cannot, then, have ended with the Messenger still upon the stage, still reciting his unfinished lines. The literary quality of the Q material in such S discourses as that comparing the work of Jesus and John (Mt 11: 2-19 = Lk 7: 18-35) forbids such an estimate of its unknown author's capacity. We need not, then, suppose that S left out the most essential part of the gospel message. We may assume that its writer did include the Passion story "in some form," presumably the form of discourse "led up to" by a minimum of narrative (p. 119).

¹⁴ This objection is made by B. S. Easton in his recent volume, *Christ in the Gospels*, p. 18.

Of course the strongest argument for this claim is simply that of inherent probability. Accordingly it may be contended that the fact that all the canonical gospels which we possess have a passion narrative as a climax arouses an unjustified confidence that every gospel writer (the framer of S in this case) can hardly have failed to see that this was a necessary element. This type of reasoning is very dangerous. For example, our present Mk has no express mention of resurrection appearances (although he clearly *implies* them). Because of this failure to include what the later evangelists chose to record and what Christians at once became accustomed to as a *sine qua non*, it has been assumed that our present Mk is incomplete (perhaps mutilated) in spite of the fact that the present text provides a most dramatic and fitting close (16, 1-8), which is certainly no more abrupt than is the gospel's beginning. If subsequent writers did not feel they had something to add, they would not write at all.

And yet, though the contention for a passion narrative in S appears to me almost purely speculative and devoid of the susceptibility of anything like demonstration, I am inclined with Bacon to think it not improbable. And because of this I am all the more inclined to doubt the need of a special passion narrative for Lk. A writer with as fertile a mind as Lk might well have found in this tissue of narrative "leading up to" some of the later sayings the material from which he constructed his own story with Jerusalem as the sole seat of appearances.

After all, the answer to this question of whether or not S contained passion narrative or even whether or not it was a real gospel, is only the practical application of a more important proposition. And whatever answer to the question be given, the demonstration of the proposition must be accepted: S is a great deal larger than Q, while Q itself is larger than has been sometimes supposed. Failure to recognize that the freedom of Mt and Lk toward their sources was not restricted to narrative but included discourse material (both parables and sayings) caused Harnack and Hawkins to be unduly skeptical about classing as Q any material which could not meet the test of word-counting. While verbal coincidence is highly important, the significance of coincidence in structure must not be under-

estimated. Failure to recognize this elemental principle — which is inevitable as soon as the evangelists are seen to be something more than mere copyists — would exclude from Q such parables as the Slighted Invitation and the Misused Funds. As a result Bacon includes as Q all of the group which Harnack had classed as dubious and which Hawkins had graded 'C,' with the exception of the two brief logia, Mt 5, 13 = Lk 14, 34 f. and Mt 12, 10 f. = Lk 14, 2-3. 5, which are to be classed as Markan (although Mk probably took them from S).

But those sections which may properly be considered Q do not comprise all the S material in Mt and Lk. Surely the evangelists did not always chance to make the same selection. In short, some sections classed as P^{Mt} and P^{Lk} are almost certainly S. While it would be useless here to attempt a complete catalogue, a few examples illustrative of the deliberate omission by either Mt or Lk of material which one can hardly err in feeling the evangelist must have had before him, may be of value. Thus Mt introduces his deprecation of anxious care (6, 25-34) with the words *διὰ τοῦτο*. The phrase is quite inappropriate as it stands, but the difficulty is removed by a comparison with Lk 12, 22-31. Here too they occur, and appropriately, as the conclusion to the illustrative parable of the Rich Fool (Lk 12, 13-21) who did depend on his "store-chambers and barns" as the birds of the air do not. The parable is as surely a part of S as is its Q conclusion. Similarly Lk 11, 1. 5-8 must be classed as S^P, since it cannot be severed from the injunction Lk 11, 9-13 = Mt 7, 7-11. Or again, other such story-parables as the Cheating Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus are to be attributed to S although Mt disregards them. But with regard to the story of the Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain (Lk 7, 11-17) the situation is essentially different. That is precisely the sort of material which Mt needs in swelling to ten his list of Mighty Works (chapter 9). His paucity of material leads him to a curious duplication in 9, 27-34 which can hardly be explained if this striking incident was known to him (pp. 109 f.).¹⁵ Certainty is of course not attainable, but

¹⁵ It is to be observed that Bacon had argued on an earlier page (pp. 85 f.) that this was to compensate for the omission of the Markan narrative.

the general principle is sound that at least some of the material which fails to make its appearance in Mt, although it occurs in Lk, is most naturally explained as due to intentional neglect by Mt, and that accordingly it is to be attributed to S.

Conversely, although S^{Lk} is greater than S^{Mt} , there are occasional evidences that from Mt's special material (P) some S-passages may be culled. Most of the special Matthaean parables are to be attributed to R, not because S did not contain long parables, as Hawkins contended, but because the majority of them evince the point of view of Mt rather than of S. The only one that can be ascribed with any confidence to S is that of the Laborers in the Vineyard (Mt 20, 1-16). The largest block of P-material in Mt which Bacon assigns to S is 5, 17-48. Other occasional bits will be found discussed in Chapter IX of the book. The significant point is not the exact dimensions of S, but that it has decidedly outgrown the conventional Q, even though it has not reached the huge proportions which B. Weiss assigned to it.

Regarding the perplexing problem of the relation (if any) between Mk and S a word of caution needs to be sounded. The thesis that Mk used S (or Q) was vigorously defended by B. Weiss and has had occasional champions since his day. Bacon accepts it without hesitation:

At all events it is equally certain that Mk knew these elementary truths of church teaching, and that he, like Paul, did not regard them as constituting the message of the "apostle," who is primarily a witness of the Son of God (p. 168).

Or again,

In the latter [he is speaking of Lk 10, 1-16] we do find interesting and valuable variations from Mk which carry out other indications from Mk 1, 1-13 and elsewhere that Mk is dependent upon S (p. 200).

In the translation which constitutes the third main division of the volume, marginal symbols — M (S) or M (S?) — occur somewhat over twenty times. To be sure, all these mean is that Mt is here dependent primarily upon Mk although probably he is also using S as a secondary source. Since, however, Bacon apparently believes that when Mk and S contain the

same material, the former obtained it from the latter, they indicate roughly the amount of dependence.

This position is assumed throughout the volume and occasional bits of evidence are adduced. On the whole, however, Bacon is content to rest upon his earlier arguments,¹⁶ which in my judgment fall far short of forming a convincing demonstration. For convincing proof of dependence of Mk upon S, it would be necessary to point out frequent instances where Mk-Mt-Lk all preserve the same incident and where Mt and Lk agree against Mk in so striking a manner that the possibility of accidental coincidence or textual harmonization is ruled out, and where this agreement of Mt and Lk shows *conclusively a more primitive form*. This all-important type of evidence is in my judgment conspicuously not at present offered, nor do I believe that we can reasonably expect to find it,¹⁷ since, as Bacon demonstrates, Mt at least, and probably Lk as well, apparently held Mk in higher esteem than they did S. Accordingly the hypothesis appears to me to be of necessity based only on surmise and not capable of itself serving as the basis of any subsequent arguments.

Instances of agreements between Mt and Lk as against Mk do occur, but they can usually be adequately explained on other grounds. Mk 1, 40-45 = Mt 8, 1-4 = Lk 5, 12-16 is an example. Here Mt and Lk agree in the addition of (καὶ) ἰδοὺ and κύριε (Mt 8, 2), in the order ἤψατο αὐτοῦ (8, 3), in εὐθέως (8, 3) for εὐθύς, and in the omission of ὅτι (Mk 1, 40, introducing a direct quotation), that of σπλαγχνισθεῖς (1, 41), and that of vs. 43 (the mention of Jesus' quite unexplainable anger). Easton, who holds firmly to the theory that Mk used S, admits¹⁸ that of these contacts only ἰδοὺ and κύριε can have the least importance. But even these two are negligible. A moment's glance at a concordance reveals the fondness for ἰδοὺ on the part of both Mt and Lk, while the judgment of Jackson and Lake,¹⁹ "in general therefore, it is clear that the use of κύριος

¹⁶ The Beginnings of the Gospel Story, pp. xx-xxi and passim; The Gospel of Mark, esp. pp. 137-151.

¹⁷ After all Mt and Lk are at least a decade, perhaps two decades, later than Mk.

¹⁸ The Gospel according to St. Luke, note on this passage.

¹⁹ The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 414.

even in the vocative is characteristic of the redactors of Matthew and Luke, not of their sources," is well within the facts. The other contacts are in every case indicative of the alterations of Mk by Mt or Lk, not in order to make the later text conform to any other source, but to improve the style or to remove disagreeable elements. That they happened to coincide in some of their changes is surely by no means remarkable. Far from Mk's showing the least trace of having altered an account which Mt and Lk preserve unaltered, the exact reverse is the case.

An example of an essentially different type of evidence cited by Bacon in defence of this theory is the story of the Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mk 11, 12-14. 20-25 = Mt 21, 18-22). It may well be, though it is perhaps debatable, that this incident is "a simple dramatization of the [Lukan] parable (13, 6-9)," but it is quite another matter to assume that Lk's parable is from S — even Easton (Commentary, p. xxx, and on the passage) marks it "unclassified" — and that Mk, having read it there, turned it into narrative. It is certainly more plausible to assume that in the more than forty years that elapsed from the telling of the parable — assuming it to be a genuine word of Jesus, which after all is perhaps unlikely — to the composition of Mk the transformation had already taken place. Similarly Mk 9, 33-50 and 10, 13-16. 41-45 may perhaps be two versions of the same event, as Mk 6, 30-52, and 8, 1-10 certainly are; this but indicates that Mk as well as his dependents used sources. A conspicuous flaw in the reasoning of Bacon on this whole fancied dependence is the apparent assumption that all Christian tradition was restricted to sources. Knowledge of the story of the temptation of Jesus or of the Lord's Prayer was not restricted to those who had read S. Accordingly the evidence of material of this sort is worthless, nor does it become more impressive — popular opinion to the contrary notwithstanding — through quantity. After all one hundred times zero equals zero.

Bacon may argue plausibly that again and again P^{Mt} may have been derived from either Mk or S even when the widest variations occur, and may deplore word-counting, but he is

able to do so only because we already know on the basis of real verbal evidence that Mt used both those sources. It is an entirely different assumption, however, that because Mk and S have apparently similar material, dependence of Mk on S is probable. The sort of evidence cited might, indeed, *illustrate* dependence if other evidence had already proved the case. That Mk and S occasionally coincided is well nigh certain — it would be amazing if they did not, particularly if Bacon is correct in his assumption that S was a gospel — but, as has already been stressed, unless numerous instances occur of Matthaean-Lukan agreements in the triple tradition where Mk's account is demonstrably secondary, all that we are justified in concluding is at most that Mk and S here overlapped. It would take many indubitable cases of such real coincidences in diction (not matter) between these parallel sections of Mk and S to justify describing them as more than merely parallel.

We have learned much about the primitive text, yet it is hard to suppress the misgiving that many cases exist which no apparatus criticus can reveal where the text of one gospel has been made to conform to that of another. During the early years when Mt and Lk circulated in essentially the same district it would be incredible were there no adaptations.

There is one strange omission in these "Studies in Matthew." Since Bacon has indulged in so minute an examination of Mt's alterations and changes of his sources, one is justified in expecting a little light to be cast upon what text is to be assumed as that of Mt. The third part of the volume is devoted to a translation which "has been made from the critical Greek text with preceding translations diligently revised and compared" (p. 264). The only other comment is, "Verses or clauses not found in the best manuscripts are omitted, their absence being marked by []." Occasional references appear in the body of the volume to "the authentic text." But what is meant by "the critical Greek text"?

From the translation itself it is hard to determine. Certainly it is not that of either Tischendorf or Westcott and Hort. Several readings are implied, without comment, for which there

is no vestige of manuscript authority. For example, Mt 6, 25b, "Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment?" and 19, 6b, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," are strangely omitted. Other readings followed are supported by only the scantiest authority, as "will be called" (1, 23 — Syr^e Ir Tert), "*will* be cut down and cast" (3, 10 — Ta Ir lat^{exc.} z), "*his* house" (9, 10 sah), the omission of *καὶ μαστιγῶσαι* (20, 19 — af[von Soden]) the omission of *τῶν ἐπτά* (22, 28 — be syr^e; it is interesting that Allen apparently nods here). The order of the beatitudes is most surprising. They appear in the order 4; 6; 5 (mourn; hunger; meek) with the amazing note, "The better Mss place verse 5 after verse 6." This is of course quite in error, as there is no evidence at all for this order; the only uncertainty of order is with regard to vss. 4 and 5 (mourn; meek). It would appear that this was not an error of printing but of statement, since vss. 5-10 are printed together as a unit in full-faced type (Bacon's convenient way of designating the addition and changes of Mt himself, that is of R) with the symbol 'R' in the margin. Nor does what is said (p. 175) in the chapter devoted to the "first book" relieve the confusion: "This total is accordingly made up by the insertion of verse 4 (in the oldest texts after verse 5)," since by "verse 4" he apparently means verse 5, which he correctly regards as reproducing Ps. 37, 11.²⁰ In 1, 16 he follows Allen, von Soden, and Moffatt in accepting the reading of syr^s: "Joseph, to whom the virgin Mary was betrothed, was father to Jesus that is called Christ."

In many other cases it is hard to say what reading he does translate, for the translation is at times more of a paraphrase or interpretation than a strict translation. There is a curious interchange of present and future tenses,²¹ a tendency to render the same word differently even in the same context ("of thorns . . . from thistles" in 7, 16), and a tendency to interpret words rather than to give their strict equivalent ("before the altar," ἐπὶ τὸ in 5, 23 f.; "the Zealot," ὁ καναναῖος in 10, 4). Apparently

²⁰ In his earlier volume, *The Sermon on the Mount* (pp. 127, 175), Bacon considers this verse "a mere scribal gloss."

²¹ This may account for the future in 3, 10.

the Western text — he calls it “the β text” — is appraised rather more highly than by Westcott and Hort, for many of its readings (not its omissions only) are followed. On p. 349 Bacon adds a Western non-interpolation to those of Hort in his footnote: “The true text of Mk 2, 26 ff. does not include verse 27.” As a whole the translation is fresh and instructive, and the method of indicating by change of type the alterations and additions of R, except the “minor ones,” valuable, although in some cases opinions might differ as to what changes are or are not ‘minor.’ For example, it would appear that “and forty nights” (4, 2), “forthwith” (24, 29),²² and “of Herodias” (14, 6)²³ might well have been deemed significant.

On the whole it would appear that it would have added to the value of the volume to have printed instead of the translation “the critical Greek text” itself in two founts of type (ordinary and full-faced) and with the same admirable legend of symbols in the margin to indicate sources. It is to be presumed that readers into whose hands such a technical piece of scholarship is likely to fall will be able to make use of Greek. As it is, they will have to consult it not infrequently to see what is being translated.

On the opening page of the preface Bacon writes: “Gospel criticism should logically issue in what is called for lack of better designation a Life of Christ,” and then in able fashion he sketches out the manner in which such a culminating study should be written. It is to be hoped that this singularly gifted scholar, than whom few are more competent for such a task, may achieve the joy of such a study as the cap-stone to his work. In the present volume much material for such a consummation is evinced. The five chapters of Part IV are devoted to the Themes the author discovers in the several “Books,” and an attempt is made toward a “discussion of the actual teaching of Jesus on the topics selected by Mt, premising

²² Especially since this change from Mk’s “in those days” is emphasized (p. 67).

²³ In view of his reference to “Mt’s partial correction of Mk’s historical inaccuracies regarding Herod’s position and family” (p. 503) Bacon apparently considers the authentic text of Mk 6, 22 to have had *αὐτοῦ* instead of *αὐτῆς*.

that the selection and adaptation are the evangelist's, and may not be taken to represent the historic fact until every critical means has been employed to distinguish between the later adaptation and the original" (pp. 339 f.). Much light is shed, and these themes are worthy of careful study, but since they are but preliminary to a greater whole, it has seemed wise in this discussion to limit our attention to what Bacon confesses was his deepest interest, the question of sources and their transformation by the converted rabbi into "the Five Books of Matthew."

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE BOOK OF THE COVENANT

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MODERN critics understand by 'The Book of the Covenant' the miscellaneous collection of laws found in Exodus 20, 22 — 23, 19 and its appendix (23, 20–33). This title is taken from 24, 7, a verse that is manifestly redactional and post-exilic.¹ We may surmise that this verse and, indeed, the whole account of the ratification of these laws (24, 3–8) were inserted here very shortly after the code of laws was placed in its present context.

In its extant form, as part of the final edition of the Pentateuch published about 400 B.C., the Covenant Code is obviously not all of one piece: its miscellaneous contents and the confused structure of the whole betray by unmistakable signs the traces of successive editorial additions over a period of more than half a millennium. An attempt will be made in the present discussion to identify the main stages of this development and to characterize the chief component parts of the Book of the Covenant, utilizing the numerous and valuable investigations on the subject.²

¹ The use of the word 'covenant' (בְּרִית) to signify the bond uniting Yahweh and the Israelites dates from the promulgation of the Code found in the Temple in 621 B.C. No prophet before Jeremiah (in passages later than 621) describes the relation between Yahweh and his nation as a 'covenant' (B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1905, Vol. I, pp. 254 f.). Rd's account of the covenant in the 18th year of Josiah (2 Kings 23, 1–3) must be regarded as the prototype of the redactional account of a similar covenant in the time of Moses (Ex. 24, 3–8); in both cases the body of laws that was solemnly ratified as the charter of the covenant is called 'The Book of the Covenant.' See further J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th edition, 1905, pp. 416 f. The word 'covenant' is not used by J and E in this religious sense: the occurrences of the word in Ex. 19; 24; 34 are redactional.

² The vast bibliography includes the works on the literature, history, and religion of the Old Testament, the commentaries on Exodus and Deuteronomy, the critical studies of the Pentateuch (A. Westphal, H. Holzinger, Carpenter-Battersby, in particular; O. Eissfeldt is chiefly concerned with the narrative sections). For the special literature on the Book of the Covenant up to 1900, see the bibliography appended to the

I

The structure of the Book of the Covenant is so intricate and the borderlines of the main subdivisions are so obscured by redactional material that critics have failed to agree even in the general analysis of this collection of laws. It is of course clear that the laws are to be classified under three heads, ritual, civil, and humanitarian (it is generally admitted that in Ex. 24, 3 the ritual and humanitarian laws are called "words" and the civil are called "judgments"), and the older laws can be readily grouped under one of these headings; but the later material is less distinctive, for the redactors, consciously striving after harmonization and constitutionally incapable of perspicuous thought, framed laws that are at the same time ritual and humanitarian (as 23, 10-12), penal and moral (as 22, 18) or religious (as 22, 19), civil and religious (as 22, 27), or otherwise confused. With these reservations in regard to the redactional material, the Book of the Covenant can be tentatively subdivided as follows:

1. Ritual rules: 20, 22-26; 22, 27-30; 23, 10-19.
2. Humanitarian prescriptions: 22, 20-26; 23, 1-9.
3. Civil laws: 21, 1 — 22, 19.
4. Paraenetic conclusion: 23, 20-33.

The last division need not detain us: it is a conflate and repetitious series of admonitions and promises that has no obvious and immediate connection with the body of laws that precedes it. The ingenuity of the critics has pointed out with some hesitation a few verses that could be a part of E or even of J, but deuteronomistic and later material prevails. It is conceivable that Ex. 23, 20-33 has no relation to the body of laws that immediately precedes it; if, however, it is to be considered

important article 'Exodus (Book)' by G. F. Moore in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, II, 1440-1451. Among the later monographs the following may be mentioned: E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906, pp. 542-561; A. Jirku, *Das weltliche Recht im Alten Testament*, 1927; A. Menes, *Vorexilische Gesetze Israels*, 1928; J. Morgenstern, *The Book of the Covenant*, 1928; W. Caspari, 'Heimat und soziale Wirkung des alttestamentlichen Bundesbuches' (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 83, 1929, pp. 97-120).

the conclusion of the code, it belongs to one of the latest redactions of the Book of the Covenant.

In spite of the fact that the civil laws (21, 1 — 22, 19) are probably as ancient as anything in the Book of the Covenant, they are the only group that is of one piece and that betrays no traces of editorial accretion (excepting 21, 1 and the redactional appendix, 22, 17-19) or elaboration. They have suffered in transmission rather through loss and disarrangement due to accidental vicissitudes than through deliberate editorial retouches and additions. The Deuteronomic point of view that pervades the rest of the Book is conspicuously wanting, in spite of the fact that, as will be seen later in detail, none of the civil laws of Ex. 21-22 was incorporated into the Deuteronomic Code without substantial modifications rendered necessary by changed conditions and by the prophetic ideals of social justice permeating Deuteronomy. If, as some critics maintain, the civil legislation of Ex. 21-22 constituted the original kernel of the Covenant Book, to which the ritual and humanitarian prescriptions were gradually added, the absence of editorial material in Ex. 21, 2 — 22, 16 has no explanation. It seems obvious that this body of civil legislation was preserved independently and obscurely without much change, except through the accidents of manuscript transmission, until it was incorporated by a late editor into the collection of ritual and humanitarian prescriptions, just as Judges 5 and 2 Samuel 9-20 were transmitted outside of the deuteronomistic books of Judges and Samuel without scribal additions, and were inserted where we now find them by one of the latest editors of these books.

The humanitarian prescriptions are likewise to be regarded as an addition rather than as the original core of the Book of the Covenant. Their separation into two sections is due to the accidental displacement of 22, 27-30 from its proper position within 23, 10-19. After making this correction, of which more later, we note that the humanitarian prescriptions follow the first part of the ritual laws and the civil legislation, and precede the second part of the ritual laws. This arrangement, as well as the internal evidence, tends to prove that the ritual sections rather than the humanitarian form the framework and original



kernel of the Covenant Book. It is obvious that some of the ritual rules are considerably older than the body of the humanitarian precepts, which is Deuteronomic in character and except for a few later glosses belongs to the seventh century. The humanitarian laws are substantially of a piece, whereas the ritual ones have obviously been edited again and again in the course of several centuries, one of these editions corresponding in spirit and in time with the humanitarian prescriptions (as shown by the philanthropic interpretation of older precepts in 23, 11a β and 12b). It is therefore plain that the humanitarian laws never existed apart from the ritual ones (for 23, 11a β and 12b prove that the amalgamation of these two codes is contemporary with the composition of the humanitarian code); conversely the evidence presently to be adduced indicates that the kernel of the ritual laws existed independently long before the seventh century.

The ritual portions of the Book of the Covenant raise more difficulties than the other sections. The chief problem is their relation to the closely parallel laws in Ex. 34 (the so-called 'J-decalogue'). The accepted view among the critics, according to which Ex. 23, 12-19 is a redactional copy of Ex. 34, 18-26, has been seriously questioned in a previous article of mine;³ the conclusions reached in it are of basic importance in this connection. In view of the fact that even such critics as Bruno Baentsch (*Das Bundesbuch*, 1892, pp. 52 f.), who regards 23, 17-19 as a "clear interpolation," are obliged to admit that these verses are more primitive in form than the parallels in Ex. 34, the priority of Ex. 23 over Ex. 34 should be admitted without question. Without restating the arguments presented in my article, and without further pointing out the inherent weakness of the current critical views, my former conclusions in so far as they affect the composition of the Book of the Covenant must here be summarized. Ex. 22, 27-30 and 23, 10-19 contain the earliest extant edition of an ancient ritual decalogue; after removing the later material and after restoring the law of the sacrifice of the first-born to what appears to have been its original position, we obtain a decalogue, the first half of which

³ 'The Oldest Decalogue,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIII, 1924, pp. 294-310.

contains instructions for the celebration of the festivals and the second for presentation of offerings and sacrifices:

- (1) The sabbath (23, 12a).
- (2) The feast of the unleavened bread at the appointed time in the month of Abib (23, 15aa).
- (3) The feast of harvest (23, 16aa).
- (4) The feast of ingathering (23, 16ba).
- (5) The three annual pilgrimages (23, 17).
- (6) The sacrifice of the first-born (22, 28b-29a).
- (7) Leavened bread forbidden with animal sacrifice (23, 18a).
- (8) The fat of the feast not to remain until morning (23, 18b).
- (9) The offering of the first-fruits (23, 19a).
- (10) A kid is not to be boiled in its mother's milk (23, 19b).

This decalogue, dating from early periods of the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan and presumably of Canaanitish origin, was variously edited and supplemented until it ultimately grew to the Book of the Covenant. The next task is to determine if possible the several stages that intervened between the publication of the ancient ritual decalogue and the extant edition of the Book of the Covenant; the theory that has been presented here will thus be tested by means of a closer examination of the text.

II

The problem of the literary transmission of the Book of the Covenant must be studied primarily in the ritual sections, for the civil legislation and the humanitarian admonitions are substantially homogeneous and exhibit few traces of editorial compilation: they were added bodily at successive moments to the ritual code during its process of growth.

The ritual decalogue is a brief summary of the regulations of the worship of an ancient agricultural community. Since we know that the Israelites adopted from the Canaanites the local 'high places' with their Baalim and their acts of worship,⁴ it is natural to suppose that this decalogue (which contained nothing specifically Israelitish in its original form) is of Ca-

⁴ J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 7th edition, 1914, p. 47.

naanitish origin. Soon after the Israelites appropriated it, and certainly not later than 800 B.C., it was supplemented with some other prescriptions of a ritual character: the acceptable types of altar (20, 24-26) and the sabbatical year (23, 10-11a β). Both these laws are early. The first one is decidedly archaic, the second seems to be presupposed by 21, 2. They may well represent Canaanitish usage, although the diction in 20, 24b, presupposing as it does the worship of Yahweh, is Israelitish (though still far removed from the centralization of the worship in Jerusalem prescribed in Deut. 12).⁵ The mention of Yahweh in 23, 17 and 19 was also added at a very early date.

This ritual collection was published, with minor retouches and with the addition of the bulk of the humanitarian prescriptions, about the year 650 B.C. This date, necessarily indefinite, cannot be far wrong and marks one of the most important stages in the process of transmission. The humanitarian laws and the philanthropic motivation of two of the ritual laws (23, 11a β and 12b) are unmistakably in the vein of the Deuteronomic Code found in the temple in 621, but plainly earlier: they were produced before D, in circles closely akin in spirit to those out of which came the D-code. The great religious and philanthropic ideas of Deuteronomy are still germinal in the Book of the Covenant at this stage. In fact the emphasis in the latter is still philanthropic rather than theological: D's insistence on the exclusive worship of Yahweh at a unique sanctuary and its corollary, the condemnation of the worship of other gods, are still lacking in this Covenant Book of 650, whereas they appear in the copy of the ritual decalogue found in Ex. 34 (vss. 12-16), which dates from 550. The humanitarian precepts dating from 650 (22, 20a. 22. 24a. 25-26; 23, 1-8) are demonstrably earlier than their parallels in Deuteronomy.⁶ Even clearer is Deuteronomy's dependence upon the prescriptions of the ritual dec-

⁵ Read of course בכל מקום 'in every place' in 20, 24b.

⁶ Compare Ex. 22, 20a. 22 (expanded later with the addition of vss. 20b. 21. 23) with Deut. 10, 18f.; 14, 29; 16, 11.14; 24, 17-22; 26, 12f.; 27, 19: Ex. 22, 24a with Deut. 15, 11; 24, 12-15 (conversely 22, 24b is derived from Deut. 23, 20f.): Ex. 22, 25f. with Deut. 24, 6.10-13.17b: Ex. 23, 1 with Deut. 19, 16-19: Ex. 23, 4f. with Deut. 22, 1-4 (these verses of Exodus are out of place and may be a gloss later than Deuteronomy): Ex. 23, 8 with Deut. 16, 19.

alogue (see Deut. 5, 12-15; 14, 21b.22; 15, 19-23; 16, 1-16). In turn Ex. 34 not only can be shown to be a copy of Ex. 23, but can be proved to be even later than Deuteronomy.⁷ The other ritual laws, the building of altars (20, 24a.25f.; Deut. 27, 5-8) the legitimate places of worship (20, 24b; Deut. 12; 14, 23-25), and the sabbatical year (23, 10f.; Deut. 15, 1-6), likewise represent a markedly later stage of development in Deuteronomy. In conclusion, the Book of the Covenant in the edition of 650 is to be regarded as a precursor of the D-code. But for the circumstance that the great religious ideas of D do not appear in it, it could be called the first draft of Deuteronomy.

But after the publication of the Deuteronomic Code, the Book of the Covenant was reëdited, about 550 B.C., in a deuteronomistic edition in which the religious views of the D-code were given a place. The editor of 550 provided an introduction (20, 22f.) and presumably a conclusion (23, 20-33; vss. 28-30 are possibly taken from an older source) in which the transcendence of Yahweh (20, 22b) and the condemnation of idolatry (20, 23) and of the worship of Canaan (23, 24.33), in the vein of D, received sufficient emphasis. Other additions, in which the humanitarian spirit is prominent (22, 20b.21.24b; 23, 9), are easily recognized by the use of the plural in addressing

⁷ It should be noted that the following additions were made to the ritual decalogue in 650: 23, 12b. 15aβ b; also 23, 11aβ. The philanthropic motive for the sabbath (23, 12b) was incorporated in Deut. 5, 14 but not in Ex. 34 because during the exile (when Ex. 34 was compiled) the sabbath was rather a sacred day than a day of rest; the other additions are found in both Deuteronomy and Ex. 34. That Ex. 34 modified the terminology and ideas of Ex. 23 on the basis of Deuteronomy can be shown from the following facts: (1) Ex. 23, 12a: תעשה תעבר; Deut. 5, 13; Ex. 34, 21: מעשׂיך. (2) The sacrifice of the first-born of men (Ex. 22, 28b) is omitted by both Deuteronomy and Ex. 34; the law on the sacrifice of the first-born of animals in Deut. 15, 19-23 is earlier than in Ex. 34, 19f. (identical with the late text 13, 12f.). (3) The change of 'feast of harvest' (23, 16) into 'feast of weeks' (34, 22), the name current in later times, is due to the fixation of the date of this festival in Deut. 16, 9 (the new name occurs for the first time in Deut 16, 10.16). (4) The mention of the passover in Ex. 34, 25b (contrast 23, 18) is to be explained by the identification of the feast of unleavened bread with the passover made for the first time in Deut. 16, 1-8 (see W. R. Arnold, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXI, p. 9). (5) The use of שחט (Ex. 34, 25), the technical term for sacrifice in the levitical legislation, instead of זבח (Ex. 23, 18; Deut. 16, 2), the term used in the older texts (and only once in P), is evidence for the post-deuteronomic date of the decalogue of Ex. 34. ✓

the people (as in the introduction, 20, 22f.).⁸ It seems probable that 23, 16aab β ("which thou sowest in the field"; "when thou gatherest in the labors out of the field") was added in this edition or later, for it is lacking in Ex. 34, 22. This redactor uses the divine name Yahweh and not Elohim (20, 22; 23, 25).⁹

The final edition of the Book of the Covenant can be dated roughly about 450 B.C. Its chief interest lies in the addition of the ancient code of civil legislation (21, 2 — 22, 16 with the introduction, 21, 1, and the supplement, 22, 17–19). But minor additions (22, 27.28a. 29b. 30; 23, 13.14) may be considered first: in all of them (except 23, 14, which is harmonistic) point of view and vocabulary are influenced by the P-code.¹⁰ The civil legislation is admittedly very ancient, with the exception of the last three laws (22, 17–19), which concern capital offenses but are couched in the form of commandments instead of exhibiting the juristic formulation: the last one is manifestly

⁸ 23, 9a has the verb in the singular, but it is taken from 22, 20a with minor changes in the wording.

⁹ The influence of Deuteronomy on this redactor (Rd ?) is manifest not only in the realm of religious conceptions, as illustrated above, but no less conspicuously in the phraseology. The code of 650 enjoined the equitable treatment of the resident alien (22, 20a.22); he supplements the law with the Deuteronomic motive that the Israelites themselves had been aliens in the land of Egypt (22, 20b; repeated by him in 23, 9b; cf. Deut. 5, 15; 10, 19; 24, 18.22); to the alien he adds the widow and the orphan (22, 21.23), which are always mentioned by Deuteronomy (10, 18; 14, 29; 16, 11.14; 24, 17–21; 26, 12f.; 27, 19), with the resident alien as representing the weaker members of the community. The prohibition of interest on loans (22, 24b) is derived from Deut. 23, 20.

¹⁰ 22, 27 forbids abuse of deity and ruler (מֶלֶךְ, 'ruler,' is used scores of times by Ezekiel and the P-code; I have been unable to find a single occurrence in pre-exilic literature). 22, 28a enjoins the payment of agricultural offerings (מִלֵּאָה is used, as in Num. 18, 27P, in the sense of 'overflow', in contrast with the earlier meaning of the word in Deut. 22, 9). 22, 29b orders the sacrifice of the first-born of animals eight days after birth: this rule has no parallel in Deuteronomy and Ex. 34, but Lev. 22, 27 forbids the sacrifice before the eighth day. 22, 30 emphasizes the holiness of the people (cf. the Holiness Code), and, in harmony with P (Lev. 11, 39; 17, 15; 22, 8; cf. 7, 24), forbids human consumption of animals dying in the field; the earlier law (Deut. 14, 21) allowed this meat to be given to the resident alien or to be sold to foreigners. 23, 13, forbidding the mere mention of the names of foreign gods, has no parallels except in late texts, such as Josh. 23, 7; Zech. 13, 2; Ps. 16, 4. 23, 14 seems to be a title for the following section (the three annual pilgrimages), and is superfluous before 23, 17 (which is old, since we find it in Ex. 34, 23 and Deut. 16, 16a). 23, 14 could conceivably have been added in 550, although it seems unlikely.

deuteronomistic; the other two may be late recensions of early laws. This code has suffered in transmission: it is obviously incomplete, and possibly disarranged in a slight degree; but critics have detected no clear traces of editorial retouching, supplementing, or expanding. This circumstance is highly significant: if this group of laws had been an original part of the Book of the Covenant, or even if it had been added in 650, the total absence of editorial material such as that which we have found in every other part of the Book of the Covenant could in no wise be explained in a satisfactory manner. Like some of the oldest sections of the Old Testament (for instance, Judg. 5 and 2 Sam. 9-20) this ancient code was inserted into an existing book by a late editor with antiquarian propensities; one can only hesitate between the editor of 550 and the one of 450; a date near the final edition of the Pentateuch is preferable in view of the fact that it has not been brought up to date in any particular, whereas the authors of the Deuteronomic code felt impelled to introduce important emendations in every one of the laws of the ancient code that they incorporated in their book.¹¹ Another circumstance that tends to show that the civil legislation was not embodied in the edition of 650 of the Book of the Covenant, so extensively utilized by the authors of the D-code, is the striking freedom with which they dealt with 21, 1 — 22, 16: large sections were entirely disregarded, no laws were reproduced intact, the *lex talionis* was used in an entirely different context. The daring assertion of C. Steuernagel (*Deuteronomium und Josua*, 1900, p. xxvii), "*D¹ hat das Bundesbuch nicht als Quelle benutzt, es überhaupt nicht gekannt,*" has some justification in regard to the civil legislation only, for in the case of the ritual and humanitarian laws the dependence of Deuteronomy upon the Book of the Covenant

¹¹ The following list contains the instances in which Deuteronomy made use of the laws of Ex. 21, 1 — 22, 16: 21, 1-6, cf. Deut. 15, 12-16; 21, 12-14, cf. Deut. 19, 1-13; 21, 16, cf. Deut. 24, 7; 21, 22, cf. Deut. 15, 11; 22, 15f., cf. Deut. 22, 28f. For a sensible and illuminating discussion of the variations introduced in Deuteronomy, see S. R. Driver's *Commentary on Deuteronomy* (1909) under the several passages. In general it is clear that "the law of Dt. springs from a more advanced stage of society than the law of Ex." (Driver, pp. 182f.). In the following instances the similarity between the two codes is far less striking: 21, 15, 17, cf. Deut. 21, 18-21; 21, 23, cf. Deut. 19, 21; 21, 33f., cf. Deut. 22, 8.

cannot reasonably be gainsaid. Steuernagel argues that the ritual laws are derived from Ex. 34 (a view that has been implicitly criticized above, see note 7), and that the humanitarian laws are derived from "a common older prototype" of Exodus and Deuteronomy (a gratuitous and unnecessary supposition). These circumstances seem to indicate, in conclusion, that when Deuteronomy was written the existing edition of the Book of the Covenant did not contain the civil code of laws; the latter was circulating privately and was sufficiently unknown to be practically disregarded in the preparation of the new code. On the contrary the ritual and humanitarian sections of the code were so familiar at the time (the considerable amount of editorial manipulation indicates wide circulation) that they were made the foundation of the D-code, just as JE served as the official source of historical information.

III

At this point it seems desirable to tabulate the conclusions that have been reached in regard to the stages in the transmission of the Code of the Covenant. All the references are according to the Hebrew text.

1. The Canaanitish decalogue (1200 B.C.?).
 - (1) Ex. 23, 12a. (2) 23, 15 aa. (3) 23, 16aa. (4) 23, 16ba.
 - (5) 23, 17. (6) 22, 28b-29a. (7) 23, 18a. (8) 23, 18b.
 - (9) 23, 19a. (10) 23, 19b.
2. The Israelitish edition of the decalogue (1000 B.C.?).
 - (a) Additions to the decalogue: 'Yahweh' in 23, 17.19.
 - (b) Other ritual prescriptions: 20, 24-26; 23, 10-11aab.
3. The edition of 650 B.C.
 - (a) Additions to the decalogue: 23, 12b. 15aβb; to the other ritual laws: 23, 11aβ.
 - (b) Humanitarian laws: 22, 20a. 22. 24a. 25. 26; 23, 1-3. 6-8 (possibly 23, 4-5).
4. The edition of 550 B.C.
 - (a) Introduction: 20, 22-23.
 - (b) Conclusion: 23, 20-33.
 - (c) Miscellaneous additions: 22, 20b. 21. 23. 24b; 23, 9. 16aβ bβ.

5. The edition of 450 B.C.

- (a) The civil legislation (1200 B.C.): 21, 2 — 22, 16 (with the late introduction, 21, 1, and appendix, 22, 17–19).
- (b) Minor additions: 22, 27–28a. 29b. 30; 23, 13.14.

If such be, at least in its main lines, the probable history of the growth of the Book of the Covenant, two problems that have claimed a considerable amount of the critics' attention¹² become irrelevant and unreal: Was the Book of the Covenant written by the author of J or of E? Or was the book inserted by one of these authors into his own literary work? Only the ritual decalogue and the civil legislation are sufficiently early to have stood in the first edition of J or E, but if they did, they must have been removed sometime before 650 and gone their separate ways until united again in the final edition of the Book of the Covenant. Such a complicated process is not only *a priori* unlikely, but fails when subjected to a simple test. We can discover no suitable place in J or E for this ritual and civil legislation, least of all in the stories connected with Sinai-Horeb.¹³ In any case the author of Deut. 5, in his restatement of Ex. 19–24, does not seem to have read the Book of the Covenant in these chapters: he passes from Ex. 20, 21 to Ex. 24, 1 without the slightest allusion to the intervening material; as a matter of fact Ex. 24, 1 seems to be the natural sequel of 20, 21. "It would be the simplest hypothesis, that the redactor who inserted the Covenant Book here was also its compiler" (G. F. Moore, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, II, 1449).

¹² See, for instance, Baentsch, *Das Bundesbuch*, pp. 59–73.

¹³ Kuenen thinks therefore that the Covenant Code was the law given by Moses before the crossing of the Jordan, in the plains of Moab, occupying the place in which we now have Deuteronomy. Holzinger (*Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, 1893, p. 179), followed by O. Procksch (*Die Elohimquelle*, 1906, p. 229), conjectures that it was the law given by Joshua, 24, 25–27 (a view criticized by E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, 1906, p. 553). In any case most critics agree that the Book of the Covenant was inserted in its present place by a redactor. ✓

LEONTIUS OF BYZANTIUM AND HIS DEFENCE OF THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON

SILAS REES

GRANTWOOD, NEW JERSEY

THE contribution to christology made by Leontius of Byzantium (fl. 520–543 A.D.)¹ lies in his doctrine that the manhood of Christ is ‘enhypostatic’ (ἐνυπόστατος) — the doctrine of Enhypostasia or Inexistence. The Council of Chalcedon (451) defined the person or hypostasis of Christ as consisting in the union of two perfect natures, the nature of God and the nature of man, without division or confusion. On the principle laid down by Aristotle and accepted by all disputants, that there can be no such thing as a nature or substance without hypostasis (φύσις, οὐσία ἀνυπόστατος), the question arises of how it is possible to avoid the conclusion of two hypostases, corresponding to the two perfect natures, in Christ. Such was the problem set by the definition of Chalcedon and the logic of Aristotle.

Leontius accepted the Aristotelian distinction between ‘nature’ (φύσις, οὐσία) and ‘hypostasis’ (ὑπόστασις), and defended the Council of Chalcedon from the point of view of a disciple of the school of Alexandria with its religious interest in the One Christ. That attitude is well expressed in the confession of Athanasius: “God became man that man might become God.” The initiative in the redemption of man was taken by the Eternal Logos, who, partaking of the one nature of Godhead, possessed an hypostasis of his own. When the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, he received into his own hypostasis a human nature that was perfect and entire. The result is that both the divine nature and the human nature are conceived to live together, without division or confusion, in the one pre-existent hypostasis of the Logos. In this hypostatic union the prin-

¹ The name of Leontius of Byzantium was brought to the serious consideration of English readers by H. M. Relton, *A Study in Christology* (1917). The works attributed to Leontius are found in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, volume 86.

ciple that nature cannot exist without hypostasis is not violated. For while the human nature does not possess a separate hypostasis of its own, it is nevertheless united with the divine nature in the hypostasis of the Logos. In other words, the human nature is 'enhypostatic' (ἐνυπόστατος). Leontius is at pains to show that the term 'enhypostatic' is not to be applied to an 'accident' or a 'quality,' but only to a complete 'nature'; it must therefore be distinguished also from the concept of 'hypostasis.' By this means, Leontius endeavors to ward off the heresy against which the Council of Chalcedon had uttered its anathema, of dividing the One Christ into two hypostases or persons.

In order to illustrate the doctrine of Enhypostasia, Leontius offers as an analogy the union of the soul and body in the person of man. Another analogy is that of the burning torch:

The wick is one thing, the burning substance of fire another. But when combined with one another, and contained in one another, they together make a single torch.

In a third passage Leontius is more explicit, when he states in his treatise, "Against the Nestorians":

Yet we do not hold that the human nature of Christ existed in some hypostasis peculiar to it alone . . . but in the hypostasis of the Logos, which existed before it. . . . For the hypostasis of the Logos has the divine nature and properties, but it does not stand in these alone. It abounds also in those characteristics which result from the assumption of the more recent [i. e. the human] nature. We have to notice this feature similarly in red-hot iron. The mass of iron, pre-existing in its own hypostasis, is subsequently placed in the furnace, when a nature of fire is begotten in it, in addition to its original nature. This fire had no existence, either at a previous time or in its own hypostasis. It exists only in the hypostasis of the iron (Migne, 86, 1552-1553).

Previous to the year 1908, when J. P. Junglas published his "Leontius von Byzanz," it was held that Leontius derived the concept of Enhypostasia from the categories of Aristotle. This was the contention of Friedrich Loofs ("Leontius von Byzanz," 1887), which was accepted by Harnack ("Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte") in the same year, and by Relton in 1917, although Relton seems to have been unacquainted with the researches published by Junglas in 1908. Junglas showed clearly that the doctrine of Inexistence is foreign to the logic as well as

the psychology of Aristotle. It is to the neo-platonic psychology that one must look for an analogy. Junglas readily admits that the word 'enhypostatic' is not to be found in the neo-platonic philosophy. He also shows that Leontius was not the first to introduce the term into Greek theology, or even into Greek christology. But it is important to observe that Leontius fixed the meaning of the term (after distinguishing it from 'accident,' 'quality,' and 'hypostasis') in its application to the person of Christ. By means of this conceptual distinction he was able to make the Tome of Leo and the formula of Chalcedon more acceptable to the religious feeling of the East.

Among the fathers who exercised the greatest influence upon Leontius must be included Athanasius, the three Cappadocians, Cyril of Alexandria, and Pseudo-Dionysius, whom our author revered as an Apostolic father. The knowledge of Aristotle was mediated to Leontius partly by the Cappadocian fathers, in particular Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, and partly by the 'experts' in the philosophy of his own day. In the eye of Leontius, Plato was mightier than Aristotle. Neo-platonism was the fashion in philosophy, and Pseudo-Dionysius had more influence in the church than Philoponus the Aristotelian. In the person of Dionysius, neo-platonic mysticism had crept into the Eastern church at the beginning of the sixth century. Like Augustine, Leontius described God as essential Goodness, and it is clear that they both derive this tenet from neo-platonism. In the case of Leontius, it is highly probable that he is directly indebted for this conception to Dionysius. Thus the Leontian idea of Enhypostasia is a product springing out of the soil of neo-platonism, and not from the logic of Aristotle.

There were many in the first half of the sixth century who belonged to the circle of Dionysius. For instance, there was Severus, the greatest opponent of the Council of Chalcedon. Like Leontius he is a follower of Cyril of Alexandria, and the christology of Cyril does not differ essentially from that of Severus and Leontius. That Severus is really orthodox in his teaching, and no monophysite heretic, is one of the most interesting results of recent investigation (Lebon, "Le Monophysisme

sévérien," 1909), and may be compared to the discovery that Nestorius is not 'nestorian.' The only difference between Severus and Leontius is that Severus, when confronted by the Council of Chalcedon, fell back upon Cyril and the formulae of the Henoticon of Zeno (482). On the other hand, Leontius continued the development of scientific terminology begun by the Cappadocian fathers, and applied to the definition of Chalcedon the concept of Enhypostasia. He was also aided in his reinterpretation of Chalcedon by the mystical piety which breathes in the pages of Dionysius. Thus he satisfied both a scientific and a religious interest, and enabled the school of Alexandria to triumph over the school of Antioch (Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius) in the christology of the Eastern church.

A study of the christology of the first half of the sixth century reveals some interesting facts. Although Apollinarius was condemned in the fourth century, his name and influence lived in the days of Leontius. This is illustrated in the literary frauds of the Apollinarians, those pious forgeries by which Cyril of Alexandria was one of the first to be deceived. The celebrated phrase, "One incarnate nature of the divine Logos," which, though Apollinarian in origin, was used by Cyril as a saying of Athanasius, frequently recurs in the course of the controversy between the orthodox and the anti-chalcedonians, and in the sixth century it became definitely connected with the name of Cyril, in whose writings it is often found. The question then became acute as to which side can fairly claim the authority of Cyril. The Chalcedonians, contending over the body of Cyril, insisted upon the fact that he was an exponent of the two-nature teaching, that his teaching was in agreement with the Tome of Leo, and that both Cyril and Leo were received by the Council of 451. Thus the Apollinarian phrase must be an anticipation of the two-nature teaching of Chalcedon. Severus and his followers, on the other hand, deny any agreement between Cyril and Leo, and regard the phrase as an expression of the unity of the person of Christ.

The first public pronouncement against the frauds of the Apollinarians was made in the religious conference of 531 be-

tween the orthodox and the Severians in Constantinople. At the same conference the writings of Dionysius were brought forward by the Severians in support of their doctrine, or rather in opposition to the Council of Chalcedon. Doubt was cast upon their genuineness by the orthodox Hypatius, bishop of Ephesus. But the voice of Hypatius could not stem the tide which was steadily flowing into the Eastern church — the tide of neoplatonic mysticism. In the sixth century, Chalcedonians like Leontius, Ephraim of Antioch, and Pamphilus cited the authority of Dionysius in favour of the current orthodoxy.

The chief opponents of Chalcedon were Severus of Antioch, Julian of Halicarnassus, Philoxenus of Hierapolis, and John Philoponus of Alexandria. Julian differs from Severus, who opposed him, in his adherence to a genuine monophysite doctrine. Philoponus, the commentator of Aristotle, was carried by his speculations into the error of tritheism.

Also among the defenders of Chalcedon different shades of opinion were represented. John Maxentius, the leader of the so-called Scythian monks, stands close to the point of view of Severus. His advocacy in 519 of the formula, "One of the holy Trinity suffered in the flesh," must be counted as an episode in the theopaschite controversy, begun about 470 A.D. by Peter the Fuller of Antioch, whose addition to the Trishagion was supported by Severus in 509–511 at Constantinople. Maxentius called the Papal legates 'Nestorians,' because they refused to accept the formula on the ground that it was an innovation upon the definition of Chalcedon. The emperor Justinian accepted it in 520; but not until the religious conference of 531 were the orthodox able to join with the followers of Severus in the confession of the Scythian monks. The formula of the monks, like the phrase, "One incarnate nature of the divine Logos," was a watchword claimed by Chalcedonians and anti-chalcedonians alike. It is an indication of the spirit (that of Cyril) in which the Council of 451 was being interpreted.

Quite distinct from Maxentius are Justinian, the emperor-theologian, Ephraim of Antioch, and Eustathius the monk.

Their opposition to Severus is very pronounced (Maxentius does not, I think, mention the name of Severus). In the religious conference of 531 Justinian had endeavored to mediate between the orthodox and the Severians. Later on, in 536, he acceded to the condemnation of Severus. Until the year 543 he had favored the cause of Leontius and the 'Origenist' party, but withdrew his support in the publication of the imperial edict against Origen of January, 543. Shortly afterward, however, the anti-origenist party was smitten by an edict against the Three Chapters. Ephraim of Antioch belongs to the strictest Chalcedonian sect, a die-hard, who opposed the cause of liberal orthodoxy as represented by Leontius and other 'Origenist' monks in Palestine. Ephraim, I venture to say, was more effective in his administrative acts than in his literary productions, while Eustathius tilts with more zeal than knowledge against Severus.

Like Eustathius, Leontius frequently misunderstands Severus, and it is remarkable that the misunderstanding rests largely upon the varying use of a single word (*φύσις*). Unlike Eustathius, Leontius is able to admire the ability of Severus, and devotes at least two treatises ("Epilysis," "Triginta Capita") to a solution of his arguments. He cannot understand why Severus is not an adherent of the Council of Chalcedon.

Among the defenders of Chalcedon, Pamphilus and Leontius are most nearly akin. They are both acquainted with the logic of Aristotle, and Pamphilus frequently cites Aristotle by name. Both of them quote Pseudo-Dionysius with reverent approval, and it is abundantly clear that they are deeply read in his works, and that his mystical piety had made a deep impression on them. If we may judge from the striking similarities between Leontius and Pamphilus, particularly in the discussion of Enhypostasia, it is at least probable that Pamphilus belonged to the same (Origenist or Alexandrian) circle, or school of thought, as Leontius, and is directly indebted to the latter for some of his material. It is further not improbable that Pamphilus, like Leontius, is to be connected with Jerusalem. If this last is so, it is an indication that Pamphilus is to be classed with Leontius,

Nonnus, and others as one of the leaders in the cause of liberal orthodoxy in Palestine in the sixth century.

Palestine is very important for the religious history of the first half of the sixth century. Early in the century (ca. 508) Nephalius, a Chalcedonian, acting in concert with Elias, patriarch of Jerusalem, drove out of the monasteries of Palestine those monks who were opposed to the Council of 451. On hearing of these disturbances, Severus hurried away from his *laura* (near Gaza) to Constantinople, and while there (509–511) endeavored to counteract the work of Nephalius. In 511–512 he returned to his *laura*, and continued to work for the abolition of the Henoticon compromise of 482. In the winter of 511–512 a synod was held at Sidon, in which the celebrated Philoxenus of Hierapolis (Xenaïas of Mabug) led the attack upon the Council of Chalcedon. Owing to the influence of Flavian, patriarch of Antioch, this synod did not pass a vote of condemnation upon Chalcedon; but Flavian was deposed from his office, and in 512 Severus was appointed in his place. At the Synod of Tyre in 515, Severus and Philoxenus were the leading spirits. The Henoticon was there interpreted as implying the abrogation of the Council of Chalcedon.

From the year 515 onwards Palestine was filled with controversy. John the Grammarian of Caesarea, a Chalcedonian, contended against Severus in the period 515–519. So did John of Scythopolis (in Galilee), the pioneer in the investigation of the Apollinarian frauds. The noise of strife between Severus and Julian in Egypt reached the monasteries of Palestine in 520–525 and stirred Leontius to renewed effort on behalf of the orthodox faith. In 531 Leontius and other monks departed from Jerusalem and its vicinity for Constantinople to attend a religious conference of reunion between the orthodox and the Severians. Again in 536 Leontius was one of the representatives from Palestine who arrived in Constantinople to take part in a synod which condemned Severus, Anthimus, and others. In particular during the years 536–553 Palestine was the scene of the Origenistic controversy, in which the admirers of Origen

(Leontius, Nonnus, Theodore Ascidas, Domitian) were arrayed against the followers of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The details of this controversy may be found in the *Life of St. Sabas*,¹ written by Cyril of Scythopolis in Galilee.

The use of collected citations from the Fathers is one of the characteristics of the age of Leontius. In his day there were at least four main collections of citations, or *catenae*, which went under the names respectively of Theodoret, Pope Leo, the Council of Chalcedon, and Cyril. These were common property for theological writers, and were widely circulated. This stock of citations was accessible to Leontius, and there is no need to infer (as does Loofs) that our author is dependent upon John Maxentius because a certain number of authors are cited by both in common. Neither can it be concluded (with Junglas) on similar grounds that Leontius is indebted to Ephraim of Antioch.

To the collection of citations associated with the name of Cyril a particular interest attaches. It was drawn up in the first decade of the sixth century by the Chalcedonians in Constantinople, and consisted of 250 citations from Cyril. The object of its authors was to prove that Cyril is an exponent of the two-nature doctrine of Chalcedon. Severus criticised this collection in his work entitled "*Cyril, or the Truthlover (Philalethes)*," in which he interpreted the 250 citations differently. John the Grammarian of Caesarea attacked the *Philalethes*, and Severus in his rejoinder to John ("*Defence of the Philalethes*," written 510-512) reproaches him for misusing 230 of the citations.

One of the results of the controversy between Severus and John was a renewed interest in the study of the fathers, particularly Cyril of Alexandria. This was the atmosphere in which Leontius grew up as a youth. In the list of citations (*florilegium*) which Leontius attached to each of the three books of "*Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos*," as well as in a similar list in the main body of his "*Contra Monophysitas*," which is a defence of the Council of Chalcedon, numerous quotations from

¹ J. B. Cotelerius, *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, III, 220-376.

Cyril occur. The object of Leontius is the same as that of John of Caesarea, namely to interpret Cyril in harmony with the Council of Chalcedon.

Among the defenders of Chalcedon in the first half of the sixth century, Leontius must take a prominent, perhaps the foremost, place. The judgment pronounced by that famous earlier student of Leontius, Cardinal Angelo Mai, is not far wrong, in spite of the fact that he supposed Leontius to have lived at the beginning of the seventh century: "*in theologia scientia aevo suo facile princeps.*" At any rate the works of Leontius have survived after the lapse of fourteen centuries, while those of his contemporaries (with the notable exception of Justinian) have for the most part either perished or else reached us only in fragments. Of the opponents of Chalcedon the most commanding personality was probably Severus of Antioch.

CHRYSOStOM'S TEXT OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK

JACOB GEERLINGS

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

AND

SILVA NEW

(A. M., RADCLIFFE COLLEGE)

THE importance of determining the type of text used by patristic writers in their New Testament quotations is universally understood, and the difficulties due to the tendency of copyists, especially in the lemmata of commentaries, to substitute readings familiar to themselves have often been stated.

Moreover, for Chrysostom a critical edition of his works is lacking. To examine all the innumerable manuscripts of his homilies would be impracticable, but a study of the half-dozen oldest manuscripts, with especial reference to the text of the quotations, is a task which someone might profitably undertake. In default of such a study the conclusions of the present article must be regarded as only tentative. Even the small apparatus quoted in Montfaucon's edition suggests how great the divergencies in the manuscripts may be.

The first edition of the Greek text of Chrysostom was begun by Fronto Ducaeus (du Duc) in 1609 and finished by Frederick and Claudius Morel and S. Cramoisy in 1636. Ducaeus published vols. 1-6 between 1609 and 1624, and Morel published vols. 7-12 in 1636.

This edition was reprinted four times:—(a) in Frankfurt a. M. in 1698, (b) in Mainz in 1701, (c) in Frankfurt in 1723, and (d) in Amsterdam, also in 1723.

The second independent edition was published at Eton by Savile in 1612 in eight volumes. This edition might indeed be called the first, for in 1612 the French edition had only just been begun, and the last volume was not issued until 1636, whereas Savile published the whole of his edition at once.

The third edition is that of Montfaucon, published in Paris in 1718-38, in 13 vols. This was reprinted in Venice three times, in 1734-41, 1755, and 1780, the last time in 14 vols. It was also re-edited in Paris in 1834-39, thus forming the fourth edition of Chrysostom, and the first edition of Montfaucon was reprinted in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, except for the Homilies on Matthew, which had been issued as a separate edition by Frederick Field at Cambridge in 1839.

With the exception of the Homilies on Matthew, on which Field's work, as in all his other books, is excellent, Savile's edition is the best, but it is very rare and has never been reprinted.

The quotations are here presented in the form found in Migne, reprinted from Montfaucon.¹ The volume and page of the *Patrologia Graeca* are given, as well as the volume and page of Montfaucon noted by Migne. It has seemed best to arrange the material in the order in which it is found in Migne, not by the chapters of the Gospel of Mark. Complete cross-references to other quotations by Chrysostom of the same passage in Mark are given in foot-notes.

The manuscripts of the New Testament are referred to by Tischendorf's symbols. In addition fam¹ and fam¹³ are used for the groups of minuscules headed by Codex 1 and Codex 13. K^a is used for the consensus of KΠ and the group of minuscules associated with them, and 'jer' for the Jerusalem Syriac.

Quotations by Chrysostom

Migne, P. G.

Volume I

Mk. 1, 24, οἶδαμεν σε τις εἶ ² (De Lazaro Concio II, p. 728; P. G. 48, p. 983) οἶδαμεν for οἶδα — NLΔ boh arm Or Eus Bas Cyr Ir Tert Hil Aug

Mk. 1, 24, οἶδαμεν σε τις εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ ³ (De Virginitate, p. 273; P. G. 48, p. 538) οἶδαμεν for οἶδα — see above

¹ Except the Homilies on Matthew, which Migne took from Field's edition of 1839.

² Or Lk. 4, 34. Cf. below and also Mk. 1, 24 as quoted in vols. IX and X.

³ Cf. above and in vols. IX and X.

Mk. 2, 9, ἐγερθεὶς ἀρον τὸν κραββατον σου, καὶ περιπατεῖ⁴ (Contra Anomoeos x, p. 532; P.G. 48, p. 737)

ἐγερθεὶς for ἐγείραι καὶ — none
τὸν κραββατον σου in this order
— **Σ**ABCDLMK*Θ fam¹
fam¹³ 28, 565, 700

Mk. 4, 39, σιωπα, πεφίμωσο⁵ (De Christi Precibus, Contra Anom. x, p. 532; P.G. 48, p. 788)

Mk. 5, 8, σοὶ λεγώ, τὸ πονηρὸν δαιμονιον, ἐξέλθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ⁶ (De Chr. Prec., Contra Anom. x, p. 532; P.G. 48, p. 788)

Textus Receptus: ἐξέλθε, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκαθαρτὸν, ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Mk. 5, 41, ταλιθα κουμι (De Chr. Prec., Contra Anom. ix, p. 527; P.G. 48, p. 782)

Mk. 5, 41, ταλιθα κουμι, ἀναστήθι (De Chr. Prec., Contra Anom. x, p. 532; P.G. 48, pp. 737-738)

κουμι + ἀναστήθι — none

Mk. 10, 38, οὐκ οἶδατε τι αἰτήσθε⁷ (De Petitione Filiorum Zebedaei, Contra Anom. viii, p. 520; P.G. 48, p. 774)

Mk. 10, 39-40, τὸ μὲν ποτήριον πίεσθε καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε· τὸν θάνατον οὕτω λέγων· καὶ γὰρ Ἰακώβος ἀπετμήθη μαχαίρα καὶ Ἰωάννης πολλακὶς ἀπέθανε· τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, καὶ ἐξ ἐνωπυῶν μου, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοιμασταί⁸ (De Pet. Fil. Zeb., Contra Anom. viii, p. 521; P.G. 48, p. 775)

om ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω — none

Mk. 10, 42-44, οἱ ἀρχόντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιαζοῦσιν αὐτῶν, παρα

T. R. οἱ δοκούντες ἀρχεῖν τῶν ἐθνῶν· κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξού-

⁴ The use of *κραββατον* is Markan.

⁵ This quotation occurs frequently in Chrysostom's works, but no further reference to it is made here except when it occurs in some special context.

⁶ This quotation appears again in exactly the same form in vol. VIII, p. 160; P.G. 59, p. 164). If it were not for this repetition it could be regarded as a reference, not a quotation.

⁷ The parallels in Matthew and Luke are identical.

⁸ Cf. Mk. 10, 40 below and in vols. VIII and IX.

δε υμιν ουκ εσται ουτως, αλλ' ο θελων εν υμιν ειναι πρωτος, γενεσθω παντων εσχατος ⁹ (De Pet. Fil. Zeb., Contra Anom. viii, p. 522; P.G. 48, p. 776)

Mk. 10, 44, ο θελων εν υμιν ειναι πρωτος, εστω παντων διακονος¹⁰ (De Pet. Fil. Zeb., Contra Anom. viii, p. 522; P.G. 48, p. 776)

Mk. 10, 45, ου γαρ ηλθεν ο υιος του ανθρωπου διακονηθηναι, αλλα διακονησαι, και δουναι την ψυχην αυτου λυτρον αντι πολλων¹¹ (De Pet. Fil. Zeb., Contra Anom. viii, p. 522; P.G. 48, p. 776)

Volume II

Mk. 2, 5, τεκνον, αφωννται σοι αι αμαρτιαι σου αι πολλαι ¹² (De Poen. Hom. vii, p. 327; P.G. 49, p. 323)

Mk. 4, 24, ω γαρ μετρω μετρειτε μετρηθησεται υμιν ¹³ (Non Esse ad Gratiam Concionandum, p. 662; P.G. 50, p. 657)

Mk. 6, 18, ουκ εξεστι σοι εχειν την γυναικα φιλιππου του αδελφου σου¹⁴ (Ad Pop. Antioch., Hom. i, p. 19; P.G. 49, p. 33)

Volume III

Mk. 1, 4, ηλθε γαρ Ιωαννης κηρυσσων εν τη ερημω βαπτισμα μετανοιας εις

σιαζουσιν αυτων. ουχ ουτω δε εσται εν υμιν· αλλ' ος εαν θελη γενεσθαι μεγας εν υμιν, εσται διακονος υμων· και ος αν θελη υμων γενεσθαι πρωτος, εσται παντων δουλος

ο θελων for ος αν θελη — none
εν υμιν for υμων } — NBCLΔ 28
ειναι for γενεσθαι } lat vg boh
εστω — none

διακονος for δουλος — a few minn
ου γαρ ηλθεν for και γαρ ουκ ηλθεν — none
ο υιος του ανθρωπου after ηλθεν — none

add αι πολλαι — none

ω γαρ for εν ω — none

γυναικα + φιλιππου — none

ηλθε γαρ for εγενετο — none
κηρυσσων εν τη ερημω for βαπτι-

⁹ This is equally inaccurate as a paraphrase of the parallel in either Matthew or Luke, but seems to be intended as a quotation.

¹⁰ Cf. above.

¹¹ Cf. Mt. 20, 28.

¹² Cf. Mt. 9, 2; and Mk. 2, 5 in vols. V, VIII, and XII.

¹³ Cf. Mt. 7, 2.

¹⁴ Cf. Mk. 6, 18 in vols. III, XI, and XII.

- αφεσιν αμαρτιων¹⁵ (In Ascen. D. N. J. C. et in Prin. Act. II, p. 771; P.G. 52, p. 786)
- Mk. 5, 43, *δοτε αυτη φαγειν* (Cur. in Pent. Acta et in Prin. Act. IV, p. 91; P.G. 51, p. 107)
- Mk. 6, 18, *ουκ εξεστιν σοι την γυναικα εχειν του αδελφου σου*¹⁶ (Sermo antequam iret in exil., p. 417; P.G. 52, p. 432)
- Mk. 10, 26, *και τις δυναται σωθηναι*¹⁷ (De Decem Millium Talent. Deb. Hom., pp. 5-6; P.G. 51, p. 21)
- Mk. 16, 8. 19-20, *Μαρκος ομοιως λεγει, και εξηλθον αι γυναικες εκ του μνημειου και ουδενι απηγγειλαν ουδεν, εφοβουντο γαρ. και μεθ' ετερα λεγει περι της αναληψεως εν συντομω ουτως ο μεν ουν κυριος, μετα το λαλησαι αυτοις, ανεληφθη εις ουρανον, και εκαθισεν εκ δεξιων του θεου. εκεινοι δε εξελθοντες εκηρυξαν πανταχου, του κυριου συνεργουντος και τον λογον βεβαιουντος δια των επακολουθουντων σημειων. αμην. τουτο το τελος του ευαγγελιου. ουκ εγενετο δε αναληψεως μνημη κατα πλατος εν μαρκω* (In Ascen. D. N. J. C. et in Prin. Act. II, p. 765; P.G. 52, p. 781)
- ζων εν τη ερημω και κηρυσσων* — none
- δοτε for δοθηναι* — none
- την γυναικα εχειν* in this order — fam¹
- 8, *εξηλθον* for *εξελθουσαι* — *εφυγον* — none
- add αι γυναικες* — none
- om ταχυ* — all but a few minn
- εκ for απο* — none
- om ειχε δε αυτας τρομος και εκστασις* — none
- απηγγειλαν ουδεν* for *ουδεν ειπον* — none
- 19, *om τον* — none

Volume V

- Mk. 1, 41; 9, 25; 4, 39, *και ο λογος εργον εγενετο· θελω, καθαρισθητι· σοι λεγω το δαιμονιον το κωφον, εξελθε απ' αυτου*¹⁸ *σιωπα πεφιμωσο* (In Psal. xlvī, p. 191; P.G. 55, p. 211)
- T. R. 9, 25, *το πνευμα το αλαλόν και κωφον, εγω σοι επιτασσω, εξελθε εξ αυτου*

¹⁵ Cf. Mk. 1, 4 in vol. VII.¹⁶ Cf. Mk. 6, 18 in vols. II, XI, and XII.¹⁷ Or Lk. 18, 26. Repeated in P.G. 58, p. 589.¹⁸ Cf. Mk. 1, 41 etc. and 4, 39 etc. in vol. VIII; also Mk. 5, 8 in vols. I, VIII, and IX. This consistency in otherwise unknown readings is remarkable.

Mk. 2, 5, τεκνον, αφεωνται σου αι αμαρ-
ταιαι¹⁹ (In Psal. cxlv, p. 531; P.G.
55, p. 521)

Mk. 6, 14, οτι δε εδεδοικει αυτον ακουε
του ευαγγελιστου τι φησι περι του
Ηρωδου· ελεγε γαρ, οτι αυτος ανεστη
εκ των νεκρων, και δια τουτου αι δυνα-
μεις ενεργουσιν εν αυτω²⁰ (Expositio
in Psal. cxv, p. 314; P.G. 55,
p. 326)

Volume VI

Mk. 2, 10, ινα ειδητε, οτι εξουσιαν
εχει ο υιος του ανθρωπου αφιεναι αμαρ-
τίας επι της γης . . . αρον την κλινην²¹
(In Illud, Filius ex Se Nihil Facit,
p. 262; P.G. 56, p. 254)

Mk. 4, 30, ο κυριος ελεγεν, ως ο Μαρκος
φησι, τινι ομοιωσω την βασιλειαν του
θεου, η εν ποια παραβολη παραβαλω-
μαι αυτην²² (Syn. Script. Sacrae,
p. 377; P.G. 56, p. 377)

Mk. 8, 38, οταν ελθη ο υιος του ανθρωπου
εν τη δοξη του πατρος αυτου (In
Illud in qua Pot., etc.,²³ p. 431;
P.G. 56, p. 425)

Mk. 11, 33, λεγουσιν αυτω, ουκ οιδα-
μεν²⁴ (In Illud in qua Pot., etc.,
p. 420; P.G. 56, p. 414)

Volume VII, In Matthaeum Homiliae

Mk. 1, 4, ηλθε κηρυσσων βαπτισμα με-
τανοιας εν τη ερημω της Ιουδαιας·
επηγαγεν εις αφεσιν²⁵ (Hom. x,
p. 141; P.G. 57, p. 486)

σου αι αμαρτιαι for σοι αι αμαρ-
τιαι σου — **NBDGLΔ 33 fam¹**

ελεγε γαρ for και ελεγε — none
αυτος for Ιωαννης ο βαπτιζων —
none

ανεστη for ηγερθη — **K^a**

των νεκρων — none

verb before εκ νεκρων — **NBD**
LC 33

αι δυναμεις ενεργουσιν this order
— **K^a Δ 33**

om δε — none

αμαρτίας επι της γης this order
— **B**

ομοιωσω — **K^a Θ 565** a few minn
παραβαλωμαι for παραβαλωμεν
— none

insert here ο υιος του ανθρωπου,
from the preceding phrase
— none

αυτω for τω Ιησου — none

T. R. εγενετο Ιωαννης βαπτιζων εν
τη ερημω, και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα
μετανοιας εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων

¹⁹ Cf. Mt. 9, 2 and Lk. 5, 20; also Mk. 2, 5 in vols. II, VIII, and XII.

²⁰ Cf. Mt. 14, 2.

²¹ Cf. Mt. 9, 10 and Mk. 2, 10 in vol. VIII.

²² Chrysostom continues: ως των κατα ομοιωσιν λεγομενων παραβολης ουσης· και γαρ λεγων, ομοια εστιν η βασιλεια του θεου υστερον επεφερε, δια τουτου εν παραβολαις αυτοις λαλω. This is distinctly Matthaean, rather than Markan, in wording.

²³ A homily of doubtful authenticity.

²⁴ Cf. Mt. 21, 27.

²⁵ Cf. Mk. 1, 4 in vol. III.

- Mk. 1, 7, οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς λῦσαι αὐτοῦ
τον ἱμᾶντα τοῦ υποδήματος (Hom.
iii, p. 42; P.G. 57, p. 38)
- Mk. 1, 13, ὅτι γὰρ τοιαυτὴ ἡ ἐρημος
ἦν, ὁ μαρκὸς ἐδηλώσεν εἰπὼν ὅτι μετὰ
τῶν θηρίων ἦν (Hom. xiii, p. 168;
P.G. 57, p. 209)
- Mk. 1, 29, ὁ δὲ μαρκὸς καὶ εὐθεὺς προ-
σέθηκε, βουλομένος καὶ τὸν χρόνον
δηλωσαι²⁶ (Hom. xxvii or xxviii,
p. 326; P.G. 57, p. 343)
- Mk. 2, 27, ὁ δὲ μαρκὸς καὶ περὶ τῆς κοι-
νῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι φη-
σιν· ἔλεγε γὰρ· τὸ σαββατόν δια τὸν
ἀνθρώπον ἐγένετο, οὐχ ὁ ἀνθρώπος δια
τὸ σαββατόν (Hom. xxxix or xl,
p. 434; P.G. 57, p. 436)
- Mk. 4, 13, δια τοῦτο καὶ ἕτερος²⁷ εὐαγ-
γελιστῆς φησιν, ὅτι ἐπετιμήσεν· αὐ-
τοῖς, ὅτι οὐ νοοῦσι, λεγὼν· πῶς οὐκ
ἐγνώτε τὴν παραβολὴν (Hom. xlv
or xlv, p. 470; P.G. 57, p. 467)
- Mk. 4, 33, ὁ δὲ μαρκὸς φησιν, ὅτι καθὼς
ἡδυναντο ἀκοῦειν ἐλάλει . . . αὐτοῖς
τὸν λόγον ἐν παραβολαῖς (Hom.
xlvii or xlviii, p. 487; P.G. 58,
p. 481)
- Mk. 6, 16, τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ὁ μαρκὸς καὶ
ὁ λουκάς φησιν ὅτι ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἐγὼ
Ἰωάννην ἀπεκεφάλισα (Hom. xlviii
or xlix, p. 495; P.G. 58, p. 488)
- Mk. 6, 23, τοῦτο γὰρ, ὁ μαρκὸς φησιν ὅτι
ὁ εἰς με αἰτήσῃς δώσω σοὶ ἕως ἡμιστοῦς
τῆς βασιλείας μου²⁸ (Hom. xlviii
or xlix, p. 497; P.G. 58, p. 490)
- om κυψας — D lat Caes
λῦσαι + αὐτοῦ — none
τοῦ υποδήματος — L harel a few
minn
μετὰ τῶν θηρίων ἦν this order —
none
- πῶς before οὐκ — none
ἐγνώτε for οἰδατε — none
- T. R. καὶ τοιαυταῖς παραβολαῖς
πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον,
καθὼς ἡδυναντο ἀκοῦειν
- Ἰωάννην ἀπεκεφάλισα in this
order — none

²⁶ Chrysostom is here discussing Mt. 8, 13 and either does not know or rejects the text of D lat syr arm in the Markan parallel, which also omits εὐθεὺς.

²⁷ The text under discussion is Matthew, hence this refers to Mark, since Luke is not parallel.

²⁸ Cf. Mk. 6, 23 in vol. XII.

- Mk. 7, 11, και ο μαρκος δε σαφεστερον
τουτο ποιει λεγων· κορβαν, ο εαν εξ
μου ωφεληθης (Hom. li or lii, p.
522; P.G. 58, p. 512)
- Mk. 8, 12, ο δε μαρκος φησιν, οτι προσ-
ελθοντων αυτων και συζητουντων, ανα-
στεναξας τω πνευματι αυτου, λεγει·
τι η γενεα αυτη σημειον επιζητει
(Hom. liii or liv, p. 540; P.G. 58,
p. 528)
- Mk. 8, 17-18, οθεν υστερον λεγει αυτοις,
καθως φησιν ο μαρκος, οτι ειτι ουτως
εισι πεπωρωμεναι αι καρδιαι υμων·
οφθαλμους εχοντες ου βλεπετε, και ωτα
εχοντες ουκ ακουετε (Hom. liii or
liv, p. 538; P.G. 58, p. 526)
- Mk. 9, 6, ο μεν μαρκος, οτι ου γαρ
ηδει τι λαλησει· εκφοβοι γαρ εγενοντο
(Hom. lvi or lvii, p. 539; P.G. 58,
p. 553)
- Mk. 9, 23, ει δυνασαι πιστευσαι, παντα
δυνατα τω πιστευοντι (Hom. lvii or
lviii, p. 579; P.G. 58, p. 562)
- Mk. 9, 23-24, τω πιστευοντι παντα
δυνατα βοηθει μου τη απιστια (Hom.
lvii or lviii, p. 578; P.G. 58, p.
561)
- Mk. 9, 32, επηγαγεν ο μαρκος μεν, οτι
ηγνοουν το ρημα, και εφοβουντο αυτον
ερωτησαι (Hom. lvii or lviii, p. 578;
P.G. 58, p. 561)
- Mk. 10, 17 and 21, και το τον μαρκον
ταυτην ανηρηκεναι την υποψιαν· και
γαρ φησιν, οτι προσδραμων και γονυ-
πετων παρεκαλει αυτον· και οτι εμβλε-
ψας αυτω ο Ιησους ηγαπησεν αυτον
(Hom. lxiii or lxiv, pp. 627-628;
P.G. 58, p. 603)
- om ο εστι δωρον — pesh aeth²⁹
- ειτι + ουτως — none
- εισι πεπωρωμεναι for πεπωρωμεναι
εχετε — none
- αι καρδιαι for την καρδιαν —
none
- εκφοβοι γαρ εγενοντο for ησαν
γαρ εκφοβοι — **NBCDLΔ** 33,
565
- in this order — none
- ερωτησαι for επερωτησαι — fam¹
fam¹³
- om εις — none
- γονυπετων for γονυπετησας — **D**
fam¹³ 28
- om αυτον — lat boh syr arm
Clem
- παρεκαλει for επηρωτα — none
- εμβλεψας αυτω ο Ιησους in this
order — none

²⁹ This support is worthless, since the Peshitto would need no such phrase.

Mk. 10, 18, ου γαρ ειπε τι με λεγεις αγαθον; ουκ ειμι αγαθος· αλλ' ουδεις αγαθος, τουτεστιν ουδεις ανθρωπων³⁰ (Hom. lxiii or lxiv, p. 628; P.G. 58, p. 603)

Mk. 10, 35-36, θελομεν ινα ο εαν αιτησωμεν σε ποιησης ημιν. τι θελετε (Hom. lxv or lxvi, p. 645; P.G. 58, p. 619)

Mk. 10, 37, θελομεν γαρ ινα εις εκ δεξιων σου καθιση, και εις εξ ευωνυμων (Hom. lxv or lxvi, p. 645; P.G. 58, p. 618)

Mk. 12, 14, και ο μαρκος δε τουτο δηλων, και το αυθαδες αυτων σαφεστερον εκκαλυπτων και την φονικην αυτων γνωμην, φησιν αυτοις ειρηκεναι· δωμεν καισαρι κηνσον, η μη δωμεν (Hom. lxx or lxxi; P.G. 58, p. 656)

Mk. 12, 32, εις εστιν ο θεος, και πλην αυτου ουκ εστιν αλλος (Hom. lxxi or lxxii, p. 695; P.G. 58, p. 661)

Mk. 12, 34, αλλα τινος ενεκεν ο μεν ματθαιος φησιν, οτι πειραζων ηρωτησεν, ο δε μαρκος τουναντιον· ειδως γαρ, φησιν, ο Ιησους οτι νουνεχως απεκριθη ειπεν αυτω· ου μακραν ει απο της βασιλειας του θεου (Hom. lxxi or lxxii, p. 695; P.G. 58, p. 661)

Mk. 14, 56,³¹ ουδε γαρ ησαν ισαι αι μαρτυριαι (Hom. lxxxiv or lxxxv, p. 800; P.G. 58, p. 754)

Volume VIII, In Joannem Homiliae

Mk. 1, 41, etc., οταν γαρ θαυματουργη μετ' εξουσιας παντα ποιει λεγων· θελω καθαρισθητι. Mk. 5, 41 ταλιθα³²

αιτησωμεν + σε NABCLΔ al lat
boh arm jer aeth

θελομεν γαρ for dos ημιν — none
καθιση και εις εξ ευωνυμων for και
εις εξ ευωνυμων σου καθισωμεν —
none

δωμεν + καισαρι κηνσον — none

ο before θεος — DG a few minn
πλην αυτου ουκ εστιν αλλος in this
order — none

ειδως for ιδων — H a few minn
ειδως γαρ ο Ιησους for και ο Ιησους
ιδων — none

om αυτον — DLΔ some minn

T. R. και ισαι αι μαρτυριαι ουκ
ησαν

αναστηθι for κουμι — none

³⁰ Cf. Mt. 19, 17 and Lk. 18, 19.

³¹ Cf. Mk. 14, 59: και ουδε ουτως ιση ην η μαρτυρια αυτων. The context does not show which is intended.

³² Some MSS. read ταβιθα, a variant found in D lat and a few minn; cf. Mk. 5, 41 in vol. I.

- αναστηθι. Mt. 12, 13 εκτεινον την χειρα. Mk. 2, 5 αφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι.³³ Mk. 4, 39 σιωπα, πεφίμωσο. Mk. 2, 11 αρον τον κραββατον σου και υπαγε εις τον οικον σου. Mk. 5, 8 σοι λεγω το πονηρον δαιμονιον, εξελθε απ' αυτου³⁴ . . .³⁵ (Hom. xxiv or xxiii, p. 139; P.G. 59, p. 145)
- Mk. 2, 10, ινα γαρ ειδητε οτι εξουσιαν εχει ο υιος του ανθρωπου επι της γης αφιεναι αμαρτιας³⁶ (Hom. lxxviii or lxxvii, p. 462; P.G. 59, p. 424)
- Mk. 4, 39, etc., αυθεντιαν . . . οιον οτε λεγη σιωπα πεφίμωσο. Mk. 1, 41 θελω, καθαρισθητι. Mk. 9, 25 σοι λεγω το δαιμονιον το κωφον και αλαλον εξελθε απ' αυτου³⁷ (Hom. iii or ii, p. 22; P.G. 59, p. 43)
- Mk. 9, 25, σοι λεγω, το δαιμονιον, εξελθε απ' αυτου³⁸ (Hom. lxiv or lxiii, p. 384; P.G. 59, p. 356)
- Mk. 9, 44, 46, or 48, ακουσον α περι τουτων φησιν ο χριστος· ο σκωληξ αυτων ου τελευτησει, και το πυρ ου σβεσθησεται³⁹ (Hom. lxiii or lxii, p. 380; P.G. 59, p. 353)
- Mk. 10, 39, το γαρ βαπτισμα ο εγω βαπτιζομαι, βαπτισθησεσθε (Hom. xxv or xxiv, p. 146; P.G. 59, p. 151)
- Mk. 5, 8, T. R. εξελθε, το πνευμα το ακαθαρτον, εκ του ανθρωπου
- γαρ for δε — none
επι της γης αφιεναι in this order
— NCDHLMΔ some minn
- Mk. 9, 25, T. R. το πνευμα το αλαλον και κωφον, εγω σοι επιτασσω, εξελθε εξ αυτου
- see above
- τελευτησει — LXX
σβεσθησεται — LXX
- το γαρ for και το — none

³³ Cf. Mk. 2, 5 in vols. II, V, and XII.

³⁴ Cf. Mk. 5, 8 in vols. I and IX and Mk. 9, 25 in vols. V and VIII.

³⁵ This list of illustrations of the point which Chrysostom is making continues with more quotations, taken from the other gospels.

³⁶ Cf. Mt. 9, 6 and Lk. 5, 24, also Mk. 2, 10 in vol. VI.

³⁷ Cf. Mk. 9, 25 below and in vol. V, and Mk. 5, 8 in vols. I, VIII, and IX.

³⁸ Cf. above, and preceding note.

³⁹ This is the form found in Isaiah but in no known manuscript of Mark. Here Chrysostom is thinking, however, of the New Testament; and in all the many times he repeats this verse he never departs from this exact wording.

- Mk. 9, 24, ἐπει καὶ ἕτερος τις ἐν τῷ
λουκά ⁴⁰ λεγεί¹ πιστεύω, βοηθεῖ μου
τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ (Hom. xxxv or xxxiv,
p. 204; P.G. 59, p. 201) om κυριε — **N**ABCDL fam¹³
syr arm boh lat
- Mk. 10, 40, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμὸν δοῦναι ἀλλ'
οἷς ἡτοιμασται ⁴¹ (Hom. lxvii or
lxvi, p. 401; P.G. 59, p. 371)
- Volume IX vios for ἅγιος — none
- Mk. 1, 24, οἶδα σε τις εἶ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ⁴²
(In Acta Apost. Hom. xli, p. 313;
P.G. 60, p. 292) ορκους + γαρ — none
- Mk. 6, 26, διὰ τοὺς ὀρκους γαρ καὶ τοὺς
συνανακειμένους οὐκ ἠβέλῃσεν αὐτὴν
ἀθετησαί (In Acta Ap. Hom. xiii,
p. 110; P.G. 60, p. 112) this order — none
σβεθῆσεται — LXX
τελευτήσῃ — LXX
- Mk. 9, 44, καὶ τοὶ πολλακὶς ἡκουσατε ὅτι
τὰ εὐαγγέλια οὐδὲν εἶχεν ὀφείλει
σκυθρῶπον· ταῦτα δὲ πολλῆς γεμει
σκυθρῶποτης. τὸ πῦρ αὐτῶν οὐ
σβεθῆσεται καὶ ὁ σκῶληξ αὐτῶν οὐ
τελευτήσῃ ⁴³ (In Acta Ap. Hom.
xix, p. 160; P.G. 60, p. 157) γαρ for δε — none
- Mk. 10, 40, τὸ γαρ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ
ἐξ ἐκωνυμῶν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐμὸν δοῦναι
ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοιμασται ⁴⁴ (In Epist.
ad Rom. Hom. xxxi, p. 750; P.G.
60, p. 672) om μου after δεξιῶν — none
om μου after ἐκωνυμῶν — **N**AB
CDLNΧΓΔ K^a many others
- Mk. 15, 9, θέλετε οὖν τοῦτον ἀπολῶσω
ὑμῖν (In Acta Ap. Hom. ix, p. 72;
P.G. 60, p. 78) T. R. 15, 9, θέλετε ἀπολῶσω ὑμῖν
τον βασιλεα των Ιουδαιων
- Volume X οίδαμεν for οἶδα — **N**LD boh arm
Or Eus Bas Cyr Ir Tert Hil
Aug
vios for ἅγιος — none
- Mk. 1, 24, οἶδαμεν σε τις εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ ⁴⁵ (In Ep. I ad Cor. Hom.
xxix, p. 261; P.G. 61, p. 243)

⁴⁰ This is a mistake, since the passage occurs only in Mark.

⁴¹ Cf. Mk. 10, 39–40 in vol. I, and Mk. 10, 40 in vol. IX; also Mt. 20, 23.

⁴² Cf. Mk. 1, 24 in vols. I and X, especially the latter.

⁴³ Cf. Mk. 9, 45 in vols. VIII and X.

⁴⁴ Cf. Mk. 10, 39–40 and Mk. 10, 40 in vol. VIII.

⁴⁵ Cf. Mk. 1, 24 in vols. I and IX.

- Mk. 3, 24, βασιλεια ἐφ' εαυτην μερισ-
θεισα οὐ σταθῆσεται (In Ep. I ad
Cor. Hom. xxxi, p. 283; P.G. 61,
p. 262) μερισθῆισα — none
σταθῆσεται — none
- Mk. 9, 44, οτι μεν γαρ ουχ εχει, ο
χριστος απεφηνατο λεγων, το πυρ
αυτων οὐ τελευτησει⁴⁶ (In Ep. I
ad Cor. Hom. ix, p. 73; P.G.
61, p. 75) this order — none
σβεσθησεται — LXX
τελευτησει — LXX
αυτων after πυρ — none

Volume XI

- Mk. 6, 18, ουκ εξεστι σοι εχειν την
γυναικα φιλιππου του αδελφου σου⁴⁷
(In Ep. ad Phil. cap. II Hom. v,
p. 232; P.G. 62, p. 217) γυναικα + φιλιππου — none
- Mk. 11, 25, οταν στηκητε προσευχο-
μενοι, αφιετε ει τι εχετε κατα τινος
(In Ep. I ad Tim. cap. II Hom.
viii, p. 590; P.G. 62, p. 540)

Volume XII

- Mk. 2, 5, αφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι⁴⁸
(In Ep. ad Hebr. cap. III Hom.
v, p. 54; P.G. 63, p. 48) om σου — C lat a few minn
- Mk. 6, 18, ουκ εξεστι σοι εχειν την του
αδελφου σου γυναικα⁴⁹ (Ecloga de
Virt. et Vit. Hom. xxvi, p. 629;
P.G. 63, p. 762) γυναικα in this place — none
- Mk. 6, 22-23, αιτησαι ο θελεις, και
δωσω σοι, εως ημισους της βασιλειας
μου 22, αιτησαι for αιτησον — N
om με — none
om εαν — D fam¹ 565
ο εαν αιτησης, δωσω σοι, και εως ημι-
sους της βασιλειας μου⁵⁰ (Ecloga de
Virt. et Vit. Hom. xxvi, p. 629;
P.G. 63, p. 762) θελεις — D fam¹ 565
σοι + εως . . . μου — none
23, om οτι — none
om με — HL fam¹³ lat vg boh
και before εως — none

⁴⁶ Cf. Mk. 9, 44 in vols. VIII and IX.⁴⁷ This quotation occurs again in the same form in vol. XII; P.G. 63, p. 137; cf. also Mk. 6, 18 in vols. II, III, and XII.⁴⁸ Cf. Mk. 2, 5 in vols. II, V, and VIII.⁴⁹ Cf. Mk. 6, 18 in vols. II, III, and XI.⁵⁰ Cf. Mk. 6, 23 in vol. VII.

The above is a complete list of the passages from Mark quoted by Chrysostom. Many others are assigned to that gospel in the printed editions but on further investigation have to be rejected. These fall into three groups:

- (a) those in homilies probably written by Severian, not by Chrysostom;
- (b) references, not quotations;
- (c) quotations wrongly identified as from Mark.

To group (a) belong all the quotations in *De Mundi Creatione* and *De Serpente* in Volume VI, and *De Sigillis Librorum* in Volume XII. The evidence for assigning these homilies to Severian rather than Chrysostom is almost conclusive,⁵¹ and is confirmed by the character of the text of Mark used by their author. The text is of well-marked and consistent type, as Chrysostom's own never is, and shows that a critical edition of Severian would reward careful study with reference to the New Testament text employed.

(b) Frequently Chrysostom uses passages from the gospels as illustration or comment in a form which is either his own paraphrase or a patchwork of the language of the parallel accounts. These contribute nothing to our present purpose. The following are given in the edition as quotations from Mark, but must be rejected as being mere references:

Volume I	Mk. 9, 42, p. 53; P.G. 48, p. 327
Volume II	Mk. 14, 68, p. 300; P.G. 49, p. 208
Volume III	Mk. 10, 33-34, p. 356; P.G. 51, p. 376 Mk. 11, 25, p. 171; P.G. 51, p. 186
Volume IV	Mk. 11, 25, p. 772; P.G. 54, p. 698 Mk. 12, 19-29, p. 155; P.G. 53, p. 153
Volume V	Mk. 14, 38, p. 458; P.G. 55, p. 456
Volume VI	Mk. 1, 19-20, p. 124; P.G. 56, p. 123
Volume VII	Mk. 2, 27, p. 446; P.G. 57, p. 446 Mk. 3, 4, p. 457; P.G. 57, p. 439 Mk. 10, 29-30, p. 189; P.G. 57, p. 227 Mk. 14, 57-58, p. 800; P.G. 58, p. 754

⁵¹ See Migne, P.G. 56, p. 429.

Volume IX	Mk. 12, 30-31, p. 336; P.G. 60, p. 314 Mk. 13, 32, p. 15; P.G. 60, p. 26
Volume XI	Mk. 15, 41, p. 767; P.G. 62, p. 697
Volume XII	Mk. 11, 2, p. 689; P.G. 63, p. 820

(c) In the following list of quotations wrongly assigned to Mark in the editions of Chrysostom, some of the instances are hardly more than allusions, and might have been included in group (b). The second gospel-reference is the correct allocation of the quotation, the first being the incorrect reference to Mark found in Migne:

Volume I	"Mk. 10, 37" is Mt. 20, 21, p. 519; P.G. 48, p. 773
Volume II	"Mk. 2, 21-22" is Mt. 9, 16-17, p. 165; P.G. 49, p. 167 "Mk. 10, 39" is Mt. 20, 23, p. 643; P.G. 50, p. 638
Volume III	"Mk. 2, 7" is Lk. 5, 21, p. 43; P.G. 51, p. 59 "Mk. 8, 38" is Mt. 25, 31, p. 930; P.G. 52 "Mk. 10, 27" is Lk. 18, 27, p. 6; P.G. 51, p. 21
Volume IV	"Mk. 12, 25" is Mt. 22, 30, p. 196; P.G. 53, p. 188 "Mk. 12, 30-31" is Mt. 22, 40, p. 535; P.G. 54, p. 483
Volume V	"Mk. 2, 7" is Lk. 5, 21, p. 531; P.G. 55, p. 521 "Mk. 16, 15" is Mt. 28, 19, p. 191; P.G. 55, p. 211
Volume VII	"Mk. 2, 7" is Lk. 5, 21, p. 343; P.G. 57, p. 359 "Mk. 4, 34" is Mt. 13, 34, p. 487; P.G. 58, p. 481 "Mk. 6, 3" is Mt. 13, 55, p. 468; P.G. 57, p. 465 "Mk. 10, 21" is Mt. 19, 21, p. 844; P.G. 58, p. 792 "Mk. 10, 38" is Mt. 20, 22, p. 646; P.G. 58, p. 619 "Mk. 10, 39" is Mt. 20, 23, p. 646; P.G. 58, p. 620

"Mk. 14, 31" is Mt. 26, 35, p. 568; P.G. 58, p. 552

Volume VIII "Mk. 2, 7" is Mt. 9, 3, p. 382; P.G. 59, p. 304

"Mk. 2, 9" is Mt. 9, 2, p. 82; P.G. 59, p. 95

"Mk. 2, 10-11" is Mt. 9, 6, p. 82; P.G. 59, p. 95

"Mk. 3, 34" is Mt. 12, 48, p. 123; P.G. 59, p. 131

"Mk. 11, 2" is Mt. 21, 2, p. 395; P.G. 59, p. 365

"Mk. 11, 3" is Mt. 21, 3,⁵² p. 139; P.G. 59, p. 145

Volume IX "Mk. 6, 11" is Mt. 10, 14, p. 234; P.G. 60, p. 222

"Mk. 10, 21" is Mt. 19, 21, p. 61; P.G. 60, p. 67

"Mk. 10, 39" is Mt. 20, 23, p. 209; P.G. 60, p. 199

"Mk. 13, 7" is Mt. 24, 6, p. 18; P.G. 60, p. 29

"Mk. 15, 6" is Mt. 27, 15, p. 72; P.G. 60, p. 78

Volume X "Mk. 10, 43" is 1 Cor. 4, 6, p. 97; P.G. 61, p. 97

Volume XI "Mk. 9, 10" is Mt. 17, 11, p. 531; P.G. 62, p. 488

"Mk. 10, 21" is Mt. 19, 21, p. 281; P.G. 62, p. 261

Volume XII "Mk. 2, 17" is Lk. 5, 31, p. 801; P.G. 63, p. 925

"Mk. 8, 15" is Mt. 16, 6, p. 385; P.G. 63, p. 514

No known manuscript of Mark has the text found in Chrysostom's homilies, or anything approaching it. And probably no text which existed in the fourth century came much nearer to it, for Chrysostom's purpose was to emphasize or illustrate the points of his discourse, and except for the lemmata it is probable that most of the homilies were delivered without full notes. This accounts for the large number of variants unattested in manuscripts and versions, and arouses the suspicion

⁵² Something is wrong with this quotation. Except for one word, *αυτου*, it is identical with the text of Matthew, but this particular word is crucial. Matthew's divergence from Mark lies in the mention of both the ass and her colt, hence *αυτων*. In a text so imperfectly edited as is Chrysostom's it is probable that *αυτου* is wrong. The Latin translator in Migne's *Patrologia* clearly thought so, for he renders *αυτου* *χρειαν* by 'his opus.'

that many others may owe their slender attestation merely to accidental coincidence. This is particularly true when Chrysostom's quotation or allusion involves a confusion of parallels. Hence, although, for example, in Mark 1, 7 both Chrysostom and a small group of manuscripts read *υποδηματος* for *υποδηματων*, it would be rash to assume either that Chrysostom read this in his gospel manuscript or that the manuscripts which support *υποδηματος* took over the reading from Chrysostom's use of it. It is simply a reminiscence of John 1, 27.

For two reasons it seems desirable to emphasize this point. First, it follows that writers on the text of the New Testament have rarely done justice to the extent to which Chrysostom is merely inaccurate. The problem of identifying his New Testament text cannot be solved, as in the case of Eusebius or Origen, by collecting his quotations and then seeking the New Testament codices which attest them. A preponderant agreement of such variants as represent a real text with the readings of some recognizable group of mss. is the most that can be hoped for. At present, as is explained below, it is not possible to identify any such group for Mark.

Secondly, the form of Chrysostom's quotations suggests that the harmonization which abounds is due, not to a primitive 'synopsis' or to a work like Tatian's Diatessaron, but to the modifying influence of memory unchecked by any special feeling for accuracy. No casual straying of the eye from the proper column could account for the complicated inaccuracy of some of the harmonized passages, even assuming that the gospels in this form were ever used in the pulpit or the scriptorium. A diatessaron might account for the misplacement of a paragraph, but not for the use of a cognate word or for a rearrangement of words to accord with another gospel parallel to Mark.

By far the most important source of information as to the text used by Chrysostom is contained in the great commentaries, or rather sets of homilies, on Matthew and John. If he had also composed a series on Mark, or even quoted in these more freely from Mark, the task of determining his text of that gospel would be much simpler.

Each section in the commentaries begins with a lemma, or

passage from the gospel which is being treated. These lemmata are fairly accurate; but as soon as Chrysostom raises his eyes from his text and begins to speak, he is likely to show considerable variation even in citing the words he has just read. Possibly in some manuscripts of Chrysostom the scribes accommodated the text of the lemmata to that which was well known to them, so that Chrysostom is really commenting on a text different from the printed lemmata,⁵³ but without doubt in a vast number of cases he is merely varying his text because his memory of other similar passages affected his quotation, even with the gospels open before him. Again and again, for no apparent reason, a manuscript deserts the type which it usually follows and presents a new or sparsely attested variant. As a rule this is due to harmonization, the result of "copying by the eye of memory, not by the eye of sight."

It must again be emphasized that, contrary to much that is sometimes said on the subject, harmonization, in the sense in which the word has been used in the preceding paragraphs, cannot be the result of the use of Tatian's Diatessaron or anything like it. A diatessaron is a continuous narrative, so composed of bits from each gospel that all the events, discussions, and parables are included. This would not result in the substitution of a Matthaean word for a Markan one. Chrysostom, like other popular preachers, takes the words of parallel accounts and by the fusing power of memory produces a new form which is a mosaic of them all.

But it is not on this large mass of unattested variants, whatever their origin, that discussions of Chrysostom's text have been based. In the Introduction to Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament, we read (p. 91):

A glance at any tolerably complete *apparatus criticus* of the Acts or Pauline epistles reveals the striking fact that an overwhelming proportion of the variants common to the great mass of cursive and late uncial Greek MSS. are identical with the readings followed by Chrysostom (ob. 407) in the com-

⁵³ Light could probably be thrown on this point by a careful reading of the commentaries and the collation of the lemmata in a few of the oldest manuscripts of Chrysostom. But since this concerns only the gospels of Matthew and John it does not enter the province of this article.

position of his Homilies. . . . The same testimony, subject to minor qualifications unimportant for the present purpose, is borne by the scattered quotations from these and other books of the New Testament found in his voluminous works generally, and in the fragments of his fellow-pupil Theodorus of Antioch and Mopsuestia, and in those of their teacher Diodorus of Antioch and Tarsus.

For some time after the publication of Westcott and Hort this characteristically cautious statement of Dr. Hort was commonly taken to mean that the text found in most New Testament manuscripts was a consistent one, and identical — or nearly so — with that used by Chrysostom. When Von Soden showed that there are several stages observable in the evolution of this late text, this view became untenable. The question then arose, whether Chrysostom can be claimed as evidence for one of these stages.

Von Soden thought that in Matthew he used the K¹-text (ΩV etc.), and that in Luke and John, particularly John, he used the K^a-text (KII etc.), but von Soden does not find the material sufficient for defining the type of K-text used in Mark (pp. 1460 f.).

When the group to which the present writers belong undertook to write in a series of notes and monographs the history of the text of Mark it became important to them to determine how far Chrysostom used an identifiable text. Two collations were made, one with the Textus Receptus and the other with Westcott and Hort. Each brings out some points and obscures others. It seems wise, therefore, to give from each of the lists such variants as are elsewhere attested.

A. COLLATION WITH THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS

Volume
of Migne

- | | |
|---|--|
| I | Mk. 1, 24, <i>οιδαμεν</i> — NLΔ boh arm Or Eus Bas Cyr
Ir Tert Hil Aug |
| | 2, 9, <i>τον κραββατον σου</i> — ΣABCDLMK^aΘ fam ¹
fam ¹³ , 28, 565, 700 |
| | 10, 44, <i>εν υμιν</i> } — ΣBCLΔ 28
<i>ειναι</i> } |
| | <i>εστω</i> — al pauc |

- III 6, 18, την γυναικα εχειν — fam¹
 16, 8, om ταχυ — all except E and a few minn
- V 2, 5, σου for σοι — **NBDGLΔ** 33 fam¹
 6, 14, ανεστη **K^a** Caes
 εκ των νεκρων after ανεστη — **NBDLC** 33
 αι δυναμεις ενεργουσιν **ΔK^a** 33
- VI Mk. 2, 10, αμαρ. επι της γης — **B**
 4, 30, ομοιωσω — **K^a** Caes
- VII Mk. 1, 7, om κυας — **D** lat Caes
 του υποδηματος — **L** harcl minn
 7, 11, om ο εστι δωρον — pesh aeth Greek lection-
 aries
 9, 6, εκφοβοι γαρ εγενοντο — **NBCDLΔ** 33, 565, lat
 32, ερωτησαι — fam¹ fam¹³
 10, 17, γονυπετων — **D** fam¹³ 28
 om αυτον — lat boh syr arm Clem
 35, αιτησωμεν + σε — **NABCLΔ** lat boh jer arm
 aeth
 12, 32, ο θεος — **DG** minn
 34, ειδως — **H** a few others
 om αυτον — **DLΔ** some minn
- VIII Mk. 2, 10, επι της γης αφιεναι — **NCDHLMΔ** many minn
 9, 25, απ for εξ — **CΔ** a few minn
 44, τελευτησει } — **LXX**
 σβεσθησεται }
 11, 24, om κυριε — **NABCDL** fam¹³ syr arm boh lat
- IX Mk. 10, 40, om 2d μου — **NABCDLNXΓΔK^a** many minn
- XII Mk. 2, 5, om σου — **C** lat a few minn
 6, 22, αιτησαι — **N**
 om εαν } — **D** fam¹ 565
 θελεις }
 om και ωμοσεν αυτη — **Γ** 131 jer
 23, om με — **HL** fam¹³ lat vg boh

B. COLLATION WITH WESTCOTT AND HORT

Volume
of Migne

- I Mk. 1, 24, *οιδαμεν* **Σ**LD boh arm Or Eus Bas Cyr Ir Tert
Hil Aug
10, 39, *το + μεν* — AC³DNXΓK^a unc⁹ al plu
40, *και pro η* ACN³XΓK^a unc⁹ al plu
44, *διακονος* — a few minn
- II 2, 5, *αφεωνται* — **Σ**ACDLΓK^a unc⁸ al plu
σοι αι αμαρτιαι σου — AC³EHM²SUVΓK^a al
plu
- III 6, 18, *την γυναικα εχειν* fam¹
- V 2, 5, *αφεωνται* — **Σ**ACDLΓK^a unc⁸ al plu
6, 14, *ανεστη* — AK^a 28 al pauc
αι δυναμεις ενεργουσιν — K^a Δ 33 al pauc
- VI 4, 30, *τινι* — ADK^a unc⁹ al plu
ομοιωσω — K^a Caes minn
τινι αυτην] ποια — AC²DK^a unc⁹
- VII 1, 7, *om κυας* — D lat Caes
του υποδηματος — L harel minn
29, *ευθews for ευθvs* — ACΓK^a unc⁹ al plu
2, 27, *om και* — AC³ΓK^a unc⁸ al fere omn
7, 11, *om ο εστι δωρον* pesh aeth Greek lectionaries
8, 12, *σημειον επιζητει* — ANXΓK^a unc⁹ al plu
9, 6, *λαλησει* — ADNU²XΓK^a unc⁸ al plu
23, *ει δυνασαι πιστευσαι* — AC³XΓK^a unc⁸ al plu
32, *ερωτησαι* — fam¹ fam¹³
10, 17, *γονυπετων* — D fam¹³ 28
om αυτον — lat boh syr arm Clem
12, 32, *ο θεος* — DG few minn
34, *ειδως* — H few minn
om αυτον DLD few minn
- VIII 2, 10, *επι της γης αφιεναι* — **Σ**CDHLMΔ some minn
9, 25, *απ for εξ* — CΔ few minn
44, *τελευτησει* — LXX
σβεσθησεται — LXX
- IX 10, 40, *και for η* — ACN³XΓK^a unc⁹ al plu

XII

2, 5, σοι αι αμαρτιαι — C lat a few minn

6, 22, αιτησαι — N

om εαν — D fam¹ 565θελεις — D fam¹ 565

om και ωμοσεν αυτη — Γ 131 jer

23, om με — HL fam¹⁷ lat vg boh

The significance of these collations can best be seen if the results are tabulated:

(1) The number of variants from the Textus Receptus is not appreciably smaller than the number of variants from Westcott and Hort's text. This proves that it is no more a typical representative of the late text (von Soden's K) than it is of the Neutral text.

(2) There are no distinctively Neutral readings; that is, none which have the support of both N and B but of little else.

(3) With reference to the subdivisions of the K-text, there is no evidence for either von Soden's K^x-text (EFGH etc.) or his K¹-text (ΩV etc), nor are there any readings peculiar to the K^a-text. There is, on the other hand, a steady recurrence of K^a in the lists of supporting authorities.

(4) There are some characteristically Western readings and a few Caesarean, but most of these are of a type which might be due to harmonization from memory.

What do these observations mean? First, that Chrysostom's text of Mark is not that of any group of manuscripts so far discovered and classified. Von Soden's suggestion that Chrysostom was the author of the K^a-text is therefore untenable, at least so far as the Gospel of Mark is concerned.⁵⁴ His text of Mark, or rather the text which can faintly be perceived through his quotations, is a 'mixed text,' combining some of the ele-

⁵⁴ Note that it would be possible to say that the recurrence of K^a showed that Chrysostom's text was similar to one of the ancestors of that group. But this amounts to no more than saying that one of the elements in the text of Chrysostom, as in the K^a-text, was a manuscript of the type of A. There is little trace of the other elements of the K^a-text. This second way of stating the matter lays a much fairer emphasis, since it does not force the decision as to whether the K^a-text was or was not in existence in Chrysostom's time — a problem as yet unsolved and which this study in no way helps.

ments of each of the types which had flourished before the end of the fourth century.

This statement is open to misunderstanding. Chrysostom must not be linked with any one manuscript which is said to have a 'mixed text.' The only similarity is the fact of being mixed, not the mixture which results — and although mixed texts were far more widely spread than is generally supposed, it is the exception to find (as in the case of Θ 565 700 etc.) a group of manuscripts which show the same variants. The early texts of the gospels spread through a wide area and, as time went on, a local text grew up in each centre, since the slight errors and variations which each scribe made were never all alike in two places. But these local texts did not remain fixed. Men and books alike could travel, and a manuscript written in Caesarea would be read in a church in Constantinople, while a priest who had grown up in Carthage might preach in Rome. The memories of the men and the pages of the manuscripts carried the variants from one place to another. In remote corners of Christendom the text varied more widely, being comparatively unchecked by intercourse with other places, and when a variant from such a text has been carried into one of the more standardized scriptoria and so has passed into a group of manuscripts written there, it is very striking.

From city to city, and from year to year in any one of the cities, the text of the New Testament varied in response to the movements of men and books, and it is but rarely that we can connect the text of a given group of manuscripts with a given period in a given place, through the fortunate chance that some Christian author who lived there at that time used it. Through Origen and Eusebius this can be done for the text of the Θ -group; through Chrysostom it cannot be done for any group which has as yet been studied.

Chrysostom's text of Mark is first of all one peculiar to himself and full of unattested variants. Secondly, it is the particular mixture of Neutral, Western, Caesarean, and other readings indicated by the collations given above. No New Testament manuscript closely resembling it is at present known.

TWO ARMENIAN CREEDS

NERSES AKINIAN

MECHITARISTENKONGREGATION, VIENNA

AND

ROBERT P. CASEY

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

ARMENIAN dogmatic literature is rich in creeds, some of which remain unpublished. The two which follow have a claim on general interest because one bears the name of Athanasius, and is an Armenian counterpart to the famous Latin spurious,¹ while the other is a curious commentary on a well-known text.

I

The first is found on f. 159b of Cod. 324 of the Mechitarists' library in Vienna, a Cilician paper manuscript of the fourteenth century. It is written very closely in a cramped hand, without word division and with frequent abbreviation, and is not always easy to read. The same document is found in the Armenian 'Socrates Minor' (Ter-Movsesian, Vagharshapat, 1897, p. 45), where it is described as a work of Athanasius, written after his return from exile under Julian, in order to restate the Nicene position and encourage orthodoxy. The text in 'Socrates Minor' presents the following variants: —

2 mštnjenawor] mštnjenagow

3 om. ičen

6 aylustek'] aylust

7 om. ew

7 hogin

7 noçin] noçunç

8 om. amenayn

9 gituteamb

¹ The Armenians also have versions of the 'Quicumque vult,' among which is found considerable textual variation. Three manuscripts are employed by Tajezi, *Opera Athanasii*, Venice, 1899, pp. 478–481. A different version is found on ff. 30b–34b of Cod. Arm. 121 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, a Crimean paper manuscript of the fourteenth century.

- 9 alberabar
 10 aylustek'] aylust
 14 p' aravori
 14 marmnaloy n] mamnaloy
 15 ordwoy astucoy
 15 xostovanemk'] xndri ban
 15 om. et' e
 16 cnaw] erewi
 16-17 marmnaçaw] ansermnanay
 17 om surb
 17 xarnē
 17-18 yorovaynin
 19 miaworut' eamb tnawrēnuteamb
 20 mioy] ew
 21 mardkayins
 22 zmez
 22 norogescē] gorcescē
 24 tntesut' ean] tnawrēnut' ean
 25 yawitean
 25-26 surb hogwoyn] ənd hogwoyn srboy
 29 om. ew
 29 om. mek'
 29 or ayspes
 29 xostovaniçen
 29 ew or etc] ənd nosa ew mek', isk or ayl azg
 içe ink' n dat hawurn datastani.

The majority of these are insignificant, but 15 xostovanemk'] xndri ban, 16-17 marmnasaw] ansermnanay, 24 tntesut' ean] tnawrenut' ean (*οικονομία*), and the different conclusions suggest the possibility of independent translations of a Greek original. Against this is to be set the large measure of agreement between the two texts, but that is less impressive in so stereotyped a document than in a more literary production. Apart from the variants, the language does not suggest translation, though formulae current in Greek and Syriac creeds appear.

From the christological section it is clear that the work was not written by Athanasius, and the reason for connecting his

name with it was probably the same which produced distinguished authors from the golden age of dogma for many creeds of a later period. The opening description of the Father is conventional, but the absence of *credo* or *credimus* is striking. The christology is evidently Monophysite, but the absence of late technical terms is remarkable, and even more so the restraint displayed in the closing anathema, where only the Arians are mentioned. It is probable that the piece was a deliberate forgery, and that the heretics whose views the author wishes to combat are not mentioned by name in order to avoid an obvious anachronism in the attribution to Athanasius. The statement, "we do not divide the Son," coupled with the insistence that Christ suffered voluntarily and not of necessity, are Monophysite commonplaces and do not help in fixing a precise date, but the allusion to the trisagion is reminiscent of the controversy begun by Peter the Fuller² and perpetuated by the Theopaschites in the sixth century.³ The linguistic evidence in so brief and conventional a document is unsatisfactory, but as far as it goes it suggests a period between the end of the fifth and the end of the sixth century.

Vienna, Mechitaristenbibliothek, Cod. 324, f. 159b.

Սրբոյն Աթ(ան)ասի դաւանութիւն: Անսկիզըն
 Հայր ամենակալ եւ մշտնջենաւոր, արարիչ երկնի եւ
 երկրի, եւ որ ի նոսա արարածք իցեն: Եւ որդի ի հաւրէ
 ծնեալ եւ ոչ արարեալ. արարչակից հաւր եւ մշտնջե-
 նակից. անժամանակ եւ անմարմնապէս ի նոյն բնութե- 5
 նէ եւ ոչ այլ ուստեք ի ներքս մտեալ եւ ամենայն ինչ նո-
 վաւ եղեւ: Եւ հոգին սուրբ ի նոցին յէս(ւ)թենէ ի յու-
 սո)յ լոյս երեւեալ որ լուսաւորէ զամենայն արարածս
 լուսով գիտո(ւ)թեան եւ շնորհօք յարգարէ ազբիւրա-
 բար զպարզեւս ոչ այլ ուստեք ի ներքս մտեալ. այլ ի 10
 հօրէ Ելանէ եւ յորդու(յ) երեւի: Մի աստուածութիւն
 յերեսին երեւեալ. եւ առանձնաւորու(ւ)թիւն անշարժ
 մնացեալ: Եր(ր)որդութիւն կատարեալ. եւ մի աստ-

² Theodorus Lector, i. 20; W. A. Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites*, London, 1923, p. 29; Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes*, III, Paris, 1922, pp. 105-106.

³ Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, II. 2, pp. 873-874.

- ուածո(ւ) թիւն փառաւորեալ: Եւ յաղաքս մարմնալոյն
 15 Աստուծոյ այսպէս խոստովանիմք, եթէ որ ի հաւրէ
 ծնաւ անճառելի եւ անմարմնապէս, նոյն ինքն մարմ-
 նացաւ ի սուրբ կուսէն եւ զանխառնելիսն խառնեաց յո-
 րովայնի. անճառաբար եւ առանց իմանալոյ: Աստուած
 20 զնա զործէ միաւորո(ւ)թեամբք: Եւ մի որդի խոստո-
 վանի միով պատ(ո)ւով երկրպագեալ եւ փառաւորեալ:
 Որ ընդ ամենայն կիրս մարդկա(յ)ին էանց անարա-
 տապէս, կամաւ եւ ոչ ի հարկէ. զի մեզ ճանապարհ նո-
 րոգեսցէ ի ընդլ զամենայն արդարո(ւ)թիւնս: Եւ ոչ
 25 թաժանեմք զորդի ըստ տնտեսութեանն: Ձի Յիսուս
 Քրիստոս երէկ եւ այսաւր, նոյն եւ յաւիտեանս ընդ-
 հաւր եւ սուրբ հոգւոյն աւրհնի յերկնաւորաց եւ յերկ-
 րաւորաց երիցս սրբասացութեամբ. ի մի հաւաքելով
 տէրո(ւ)թիւն եւ աստուածո(ւ)թիւն ամենասուրբ եր-
 րորդութեանն: Եւ արդ մեք այսպէս խոստովանիմք.
 30 եւ որ ոչ այսպէս խոստովանի նզովեմք որպէս սուրբ
 հարքն նզովեցին զԱրիոս եւ ընդ նմին զամենայն հերձ-
 ուածողսն:

Creed of St. Athanasius: Eternal Father, omnipotent and everlasting, maker of heaven and earth and the creatures which are upon it;⁴ and the Son, begotten of the Father and co-eternal [with him], having come into being timelessly and immaterially from the same substance and not from elsewhere, and all things were made by him; and the Holy Spirit, appearing from their essence as light from light, who illumines all creatures by the light of knowledge and, like a spring,⁵ distributes gifts by grace, and he did not come into being from elsewhere but came from the Father and appears from the Son, one Godhead appearing in three <persons> and preserving unchanged its individuality, a perfect Trinity and one glorious Godhead. And concerning the incarnation of God we thus confess that he who was indescribably and immaterially begotten of the Father, the same was incarnate of the Holy Virgin and mixed the unmixable in

⁴ Cf. Gregory the Illuminator, *Stromata* II (Venice, 1838), p. 16, *lusaworē zerkir ew or i sma en ararack'*. Cf. Aphraates, *Hom.* 1, 15.

⁵ Cf. Gregory the Illuminator, *ibid.*, p. 18, *hogwoyn srboy or ałbiurabar bašxeaq šnorhs yararacs*.

her womb indescribably and incomprehensibly. God made him by combinations, and one Son is confessed, worshipped, and glorified with one worship; who passed through all human sufferings without spot, voluntarily and not by necessity, so that he will renew for us the way to fulfil all righteousness. And we do not divide the Son according to an economy, because Jesus Christ, yesterday and today the same and forever, is praised with the Father and the Holy Spirit by things in heaven and things on earth with a trisagion, being summed up in the one Lordship and Godhead of the all-holy Trinity. And now we thus confess; and he who does not so confess we anathematize as the holy Fathers anathematized Arius and all the heretics with him.

II

The second creed, occupying f. 159a–b of the same codex, is a commentary on the formula regularly used in the liturgy of the Armenian church.⁶ The commentary consists of brief notes, based mainly on Epiphanius, which interrupt the text to indicate the heresies that each clause is particularly useful in refuting. None of the heretics mentioned are later than the fifth century.⁷

Vienna, Mechitaristenbibliothek, Cod. 324, f. 159a–b

Հաւատամք զոր կարգեցին սուրբ Հարքն ի Նինիայ:
 — Հաւատամք ի մի Ած. Հայր ամենակալ, յարարիչն
 երկնի եւ երկրի. երեւելեաց եւ աներեւութից: Յանդի-
 մանեալ կշտամբին ամենայն հեթանոսք. որք քաղում
 ւծս. ասեն: Եւ ի մի՝ տուն. Յս. Քս. յորդին Այ. ծըն- 5
 եալն յԱյ. Հաւրէ միածին, աշխնքն յեւթենէ Հաւր: ⁸
 Կշտամբեալ յանդիմանի ժողովն Քաղկեդոնի որ ասեն
 ք. բնութիւնս ի Քս.: Ած. յԱյ, լոյս ի լուսոյ: Յանդի-
 մանի Պաւղոս Սամոստացի որ ասաց թէ Յս. մարդ էր:

⁶ The variants from the text published by J. Categrian, *De fidei symbolo quo Armenii utuntur observationes*, Vienna, 1893, pp. 1–2, are inconsiderable.

⁷ Categrian (pp. 19–21) supposes the Armenian text to have originated at the end of the sixth century and to have found its way into the liturgy early in the seventh.

⁸ So other mss.; cf. Categrian, p. 18; but the vulgate text reads *նախ քան զս-մենայն յաւիտեանս*.

- 10 Ած. ճշմարիտ յԱյ. ճշմարտէ ծնունդ եւ ոչ արարած. նոյն ինքն ի բնութենէ հաւր: Յիրարի նգովեցաւ Արիոս, որ ասաց թէ որդի չէ ծնեալ ի բնութենէ հաւր. այլ արարեալ: Որով մամենայն ինչ եղեւ յերկինս եւ ի վերա(յ) երկրի, երեւելիք եւ աներեւոյթք. որ յաղագս մեր մարդկան եւ վասն մերո(յ) փրկո(ւ)թեան իջեալ
- 15 յերկնից, մարմնացաւ, մարդացաւ, ծնաւ կատարելապէս ի Մարիամա(յ) սրբո(յ) կուսէն հոգւով սրբով: Դատապարտեալ նգովի ամբ (ար illeg) իշտն Նստոր, որ սոսկ մարդ ասաց զծնեալն ի կուսէն: Որով էառ մարմին, հոգի եւ միտք, եւ զամենայն որ ինչ է ի մարդ: Կշտամբեալ յանդիմանի նգովեալն Ապողինար, որ ասէ մարմին ի կուսէն, բայց հոգի եւ միտս ոչ առ: Նգովի եւ Եւտիֆես, որ ասաց յերկնից ունել զմարմինն, այլ ոչ ի սուրբ կուսէն: Ճշմարտապէս եւ ոչ կարծեաւք: Յան-
- 25 դիմանի նգովեալն Մանի եւ Մարկիոն եւ Բարդեժան, որք ասացին առ աչաւք եւ կարծեաւք եւ նմանութեամբ երեւեցաւ Որդին Այ. յաշխարհի: Չարչարեալ, խաչեալ, թաղեալ, յերրորդ աւուր յարուցեալ: Նգովի ժողովն Քաղկեդոնի եւ Տումարն Լիւոնի, որք ասացին, ա՛յլ է որ չարչարեցաւն, եւ ա՛յլ է որ յարեաւն: Ելեալ յերկինս նովին մարմնով, նստաւ ընդ յաջմէ հաւր. գալոց է նովին մարմնովն եւ փառաւք հաւր դատել զկենդանիս եւ զմեռեալս, որոյ թագաւորո(ւ)թեանն ոչ գո(յ) վախճան: Ընդդէմ հրէից եւ հեթանոսաց եւ այլ
- 35 աղանդոց, որք ասեն եթէ յարեգակնեդ զմարմինն զի պատուեսցի: Հաւատամք եւ ի Սուրբ Հոգին յանեղն եւ ի կատարեալ, որ խաւսեցաւ յաւրէնս եւ ի մարգարէս եւ յաւետարանս, որ էջն ի Յորդանան, քարոզեաց զառաքեալն. եւ բնակեցաւ ի սուրբսն: Դատապարտեալ
- 40 նգովի Մակեդոն, որ ասաց թէ Հոգին Սուրբ ն(ո)ւազ է քան զՀայր եւ զՈրդի: Հաւատամք եւ յայս միայն ընդհանրական եւ արաքելական եկեղեցի: Ասացին ոչ է պարտ ընդունել արտաքս քան զՆիկիական եկեղեցւոյն ժողովն: Ի մի մկրտո(ւ)թիւն, յապաշխարութիւն, ի
- 45 քաւո(ւ)թիւն եւ ի թողո(ւ)թիւն մեղաց: Յանդիմանի Մարկիոն, որ երիցս մկրտել սահմանեաց: Այլ խոտեն եւ զայս բազումք, որ յորովից ի Յորդանան մկրտին, զի անհնար է մկրտելոցն միւսանգամ մկրտել ըստ գրոց:

Ի յարո(ւ)թիւն մեռելոց, ի դատաստանսն յաւիտենից
 Հոգւոց եւ մարմնոց, յարքայո(ւ)թիւն երկնից եւ ի 50
 կեանսն յաւիտենականս: Պատկառեալ ամաչեացեն եւ
 զղջացին Մանի եւ Մարկիոն եւ Թեոդոս եւ իշխանա-
 կանքն եւ այլքն, որք ոչ ունին ակն յարո(ւ)թեան դա-
 տաստանի: Իսկ որք ասենն, էր երբեմն, յորժամ ոչ էր
 Որդի, կամ էր երբեմն յորժամ, ոչ էր Սուրբ Հոգի, 55
 կամ թէ յոչեից եղեն, կամ յայլմէ էո(ւ)թենէ ասեն լի-
 նել զՈրդին Այ. եւ կամ զՍուրբ Հոգին, եւ թէ փոփոխե-
 լի են կամ ալլալելի, զայնպիսիսն նշովէ Կաթողիկէ եւ
 Առաքելական Եկեղեցի: Սոքա նշովին, Սաքել, Փոտի-
 նոս, Վաշեկոսիանոս, Պորփիր, Մարկիոն, Զութորիս, 60
 եւ համարեն միախորհիք նոցին, չորրորդ ժողովն. ա-
 մեն.

Creed which the holy Fathers at Nicea formulated: We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of things visible and invisible: All the heathen are rebuked and answered, who say there are many gods: and in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God begotten of God the Father, as only-begotten, i. e. from the essence of the Father: The Chalcedonian council is censured and rebuked, which says there are two natures in Christ: God of God, Light of Light: Paul of Samosata is rebuked, who says that Jesus was a man: very God of very God, begotten and not made, the same [being] of the substance of the Father: Arius is rightly condemned, who said that the Son was not begotten from the substance of the Father but was made: by whom all things in heaven and on the earth were made, both visible and invisible: who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate, was made man, [and] was perfectly conceived of the holy Virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit: The impious Nestorius is condemned and censured, who said it was an ordinary man born from the Virgin: from whom he received a body, spirit, and mind, and everything which pertains to a man: The accursed Apollinarius is condemned and rebuked, who says [that] the body is from the Virgin but the spirit and mind he did not take [from her]. Eutyches is also condemned, who said he had the body from heaven but not from the Holy Virgin: truly and

not in imagination: *The accursed Mani is condemned and Marcion and Bardesanes, who said in appearance and in imagination, and in a likeness the Son of God appeared in the world: he suffered, was crucified, was buried, [and] rose on the third day: The council of Chalcedon is condemned and the Tome of Leo, which said that there was one who suffered and another who rose: coming into heaven in the same body, he sat down on the right hand of the Father; he will return in the same body in the glory of the Father to judge the living and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end: Against the Jews and heathen and other heresies, who say the body is from the sun so that it should be honored:*⁹ and we believe in the Holy Spirit, uncreated and perfect, who spoke in the law and in the prophets [and] in the gospels, who descended on the Jordan, who proclaimed the messenger, and dwelt in the saints: *Macedonius is condemned and censured, who said that the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Father and the Son: we believe in this one Catholic and Apostolic Church: They said it was impossible to receive other than the council of the Nicene church: in one baptism [and] repentance [and] the pardon and remission of sins: Marcion is condemned, who instituted triple baptism,*¹⁰ *but many also despise this and even many who were baptized often in the Jordan,*¹¹ *because it is impossible for those who are baptized to be baptized again according to the Scriptures: in the resurrection of the dead, in the eternal judgment of spirits and bodies, in the kingdom of heaven and in eternal life: Let them be ashamed and confounded and repentant, Mani and Marcion and Theodos*¹² *and the archontikoi and others,*¹³ *who do not expect a resurrection to judgment; but those who say there was a time when the Son was not, or there was a time when the Holy Spirit was not, or that they came out of nothing, or say that the Son of God or the Holy Spirit are of another substance and that they*

⁹ The Jews here intended are undoubtedly the so-called Heliognosti or Deinviectiaci, Philaster, Div. haer. liber, 10. The heathen are evidently Zoroastrians.

¹⁰ Epiphanius, Haer. 42, 3, 6 (see A. von Harnack, Marcion [Texte und Untersuchungen 44], p. 175). This detail is given by Eznik iv. 16 (Schmidt's transl., p. 204).

¹¹ Probably the Hemerobaptists; cf. Epiphanius, Haer. 17.

¹² Cf. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. vii. 106, 4.

¹³ Cf. Epiphanius, Haer. 40, 8.

are changeable and alterable, those the Catholic and Apostolic Church condemns: *These are condemned, Sabellius, Photinus,¹⁴ Valentinus, Porphyry,¹⁵ Marcion, Zouthoris,¹⁶ and all who think with them [and] the Fourth Council: Amen.*

¹⁴ Photinus, the follower of Marcellus of Ancyra; cf. Epiphanius, Haer. 71.

¹⁵ Porphyry, patriarch of Antioch A.D. 404-413; see Dictionary of Christian Biography, IV, p. 443.

¹⁶ Can this be a corruption of Zarathustra? Cf. note 7 above; on the wide variety of confusion over this name see A. V. Williams Jackson, Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran, New York, 1899, pp. 12 f.

